WOODLANDS CEMETERY
4000 Woodlands Avenue
Philadelphia
Philadelphia County
Pennsylvania

HALS PA-5
PA-5

PHOTOGRAPHS

PAPER COPIES OF COLOR TRANSPARENCIES

WRITTEN HISTORICAL AND DESCRIPTIVE DATA

REDUCED COPIES OF MEASURED DRAWINGS

FIELD RECORDS

HISTORIC AMERICAN LANDSCAPES SURVEY
National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior
1849 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20240-0001

HISTORIC AMERICAN LANDSCAPES SURVEY

WOODLANDS CEMETERY

HALS No. PA–5

NOTE: This report concentrates on Woodlands Cemetery (1840) and, to a lesser extent, on the grounds of The Woodlands, an eighteenth-century estate from which the cemetery was formed. Readers interested in the site's neoclassical mansion should consult Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) No. PA-1125, especially the 2002-03 "addendum," and its accompanying drawings and photographs. An interpretive division between landscape and architecture, while a practical necessity, is awkward in several respects. On one hand, it violates the unifying principle around which the estate was designed. On the other, it generates overlapping narratives. While the HABS and HALS projects are largely self-contained, a broad understanding of this cultural landscape requires reading them as complementary.

Location: 4000 Woodland Avenue, Philadelphia, Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania.

Owner: The Woodlands Cemetery Company of Philadelphia.

Present Use: Cemetery, tennis courts, equipment storage, and maintenance.

Significance: Philadelphia's Woodlands Cemetery occupies the grounds of an estate recognized throughout post-Revolutionary America as a leading example of English taste in architecture and landscape gardening. This was William Hamilton's Woodlands, formed in the late eighteenth century on the low bluff where Mill Creek, now buried, meets the Schuylkill River. The mansion, a National Historic Landmark, has long been the subject of scholarly inquiry. Serious study of the building's environs is more recent.

The Woodlands today is an amalgam, reworked over time for individual and institutional uses. During the late-eighteenth century, eminent botanist and plant collector William Hamilton (1745–1813) made the property a New World model of contemporary English gardening techniques. Employing principles advanced by Lancelot Brown, Thomas Whately, and nurserymen such as Nathaniel Swinden, he created an elaborate tableau that Thomas Jefferson called "the only rival which I have known in America to what may be seen in England."[1]

---

[1] Thomas Jefferson to William Hamilton, [n.d.] July 1806, in *Thomas Jefferson's Garden Book 1766-1824*, ed. Edwin Morris Betts (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1944), 323.

Some forty years after Jefferson's compliment, the estate underwent a second transformation at the hands of the Woodlands Cemetery Company. Founded in 1840, this venture set out to remake Hamilton's estate in the form of a new metropolitan amenity known as a rural cemetery. Local and national precedent existed for such a project. Like Mount Auburn Cemetery in Cambridge, Massachusetts (1831), Woodlands offered private burial plots in a Romantic riverside setting. Still more like Philadelphia's Laurel Hill (1836), the new cemetery occupied the grounds of a former country seat and was administered by a business corporation.

But The Woodlands made its own, distinctive contribution to the rural cemetery movement. Aware of the property's history, dramatic topography and proximity to the city, the company's projectors set out to create a landscape as appealing for its genteel associations as for its natural beauty. Hamilton's mansion and aged trees held special significance for lawyer Eli K. Price. As the cemetery's leading advocate and principal public face, he argued that the institution not only met the sanitary, aesthetic, and emotional needs of Philadelphia but also served as the steward of a hallowed place.

In time, similar ideas would prove crucial to the establishment of Philadelphia's Fairmount Park. Given Price's central role in that undertaking and his other contributions to public horticulture, The Woodlands arguably emerges as the microcosm of a popularizing process at work in the American landscape. Conceived as a private estate in high English style, it became widely accessible as a sort of proto-park and helped incubate an institution that was truly public in nature. This, at least, is the prevailing interpretation of the site's historical significance. While there is evidence to support such claims, recent research may help relocate Woodland Cemetery within the more private economy of mid-nineteenth-century real estate development.

Historian: Aaron V. Wunsch, Ph.D. candidate, University of California at Berkeley.

PART I. HISTORICAL INFORMATION

A. Physical History:

1. Dates of construction:

- Ca. 1780–1813 (Hamilton era). William Hamilton inherited the tract on which he would create The Woodlands in 1747, at age two. By this time, white settlers had farmed parts of the land for over half a century and built a modest house somewhere on the premises. Hamilton came of age in 1766 and evidently erected the core of the present mansion in the next eight years. While his earliest efforts at landscape design occurred in this period, his first recorded intention to create a "small park" set apart from a rolling lawn dates to 1779, and it was not until 1785 that he explicitly set out to remake the grounds as a horticultural showcase. A decade later, visitors believed Hamilton had achieved this effect; all major garden features were in place, along with an expansive greenhouse. Yet The Woodlands remained a work in progress. Hamilton and his gardeners continued to test the viability and placement of various plant species throughout his lifetime.

- 1839–1878 (principal era of cemetery development). Preliminary surveying for cemetery purposes started in 1839 and apparently yielded the first "draft or plan" in the winter of 1841–1842. This scheme, devised by surveyor Philip M. Price, identified future road locations and was lithographed when new sections of burial lots were added. From 1843 through the mid 1850s, a series of planting campaigns transformed the site's appearance while the 1853 sale of the "river front" tract to the West Chester & Philadelphia Railroad permanently altered the viewshed. In 1857, architect John McArthur, Jr.'s Roman Doric entrance reached completion. More sections were established over the next two decades.

- 1936–1937, 1947–1948, 1955–1965 (dates of significant alterations). The City of Philadelphia condemned land along the cemetery's eastern border in 1933, requiring the subsequent demolition of McArthur's gate. The replacement was designed by Paul Cret in 1936 and completed the following year. It was moved in 1948 following a second condemnation that necessitated relocation of the entrance road. More land was ceded to the City in 1955 to accommodate a sewer line near the railroad right-of-way. In order to soften the visual effects of these changes, the cemetery commissioned landscape architects Wheelwright, Stevenson & Langran to design a new planting plan. Their scheme, conceived in 1957 and modified over the next eight years, established a dense screen of trees and hedges along the southern and eastern margins of the site.

2. Owners:

Three generations of Hamiltons were responsible for assembling the Woodlands estate as it stood in its heyday: a sprawling plantation on the west bank of the Schuylkill River that encompassed 600 acres in 1789.[2] From his father, William inherited the 356-acre "core tract" on which he would reside. Some 91 acres were considered "annexed to the Mansion house" at the time of his death (1813),[3] and heirs struggled to retain this parcel until 1827. In that year, mounting debts led to seizure and disposal at a sheriff's sale. The buyer, a distant Hamilton in-law, soon resold the property on the family's behalf. The following is a chain of title for The Woodlands since its passage from the Hamilton family.

2 January 1828, Henry Beckett and wife Mary to Thomas Flemming.
Property: The Woodlands as conveyed since William Hamilton's death, i.e. approximately 91 acres including the mansion house and stables.
Price: $30,000.
Source: Deed Book G.W.R. v. 22, p. 578 and following.[4]

10 August 1831, Thomas Flemming and wife Clarissa to Thomas Mitchell.
Property: same as above, described as "about" 91.5 acres.
Price: $30,000 (but see below).
Source: Deed Book A.M. v. 16, p. 376 and following.
Note: the deed misleadingly refers to the $30,000 purchase price as being paid "in hand" by Mitchell. In fact, Mitchell agreed to purchase The Woodlands for $40,000, paying Thomas Flemming the first $20,000 in four cash installments over a five-year period and giving him a mortgage for the remainder.[5]

17 January 1834, Thomas Mitchell to Thomas Kittera
Property: 3/8 of the Woodlands tract.
Price: $15,000.
Source: unrecorded deed in Woodlands Cemetery Company Collection, Historical Society of Pennsylvania (hereafter WCCC).
Note: the purchase price was likely determined by the amount Mitchell owed Flemming in cash installments, only one of which had been paid by this time.

---

[2] For owners from the colonial period through 1828, see James A. Jacobs, "Addendum to the Woodlands," HABS PA-1125 (2002), pp. 9-16.

[3] Samuel Haines, "Survey of part of the Woodlands Estate belonging to James Hamilton Esq.," October 1813, General Thomas Cadwalader Papers, Cadwalader Coll., Series 3, Box 108, Historical Society of Pennsylvania (hereafter **HSP**). The document shows the estate east of Darby Road, containing 297 acres, 2 perches. Of this, the "part annexed to the Mansion house" measures 91 acres, 2 perches.

[4] All deed references are to material in the City of Philadelphia Municipal Archives (hereafter **CPMA**) unless otherwise noted.

[5] Mortgage, Thomas Mitchell to Thomas Flemming, 10 Aug 1831, Woodlands Cemetery Company Coll. (hereafter **WCCC**), HSP, also recorded 22 August 1831 in Philadelphia Mortgage Book A.M. v. 7, p. 67 and following. A note on the original document shows that Flemming assigned the mortgage and a claim of $15,000 (Mitchell's promised down-payment less his first installment) to merchant Peter Bousquet, recorded 1 December 1834 in Mortgage Book A.M. v. 21, p. 352 and following. Another note shows the mortgage was satisfied on 13 June 1851.

Mitchell apparently kept this transaction secret from later business partners. Eli Price jotted on the document: "This deed was not known to me when I took title in 1843 for the Woodlands Cemetery Company. It was delivered to me, as having been in the custody of Samuel Edwards Esquire, in 1849, with the deed from Anna Kittera Exc [executrix] of 1840, to Thomas Mitchell," on which, see below.

23 July 1836, Mary Jones and other Jones heirs to Thomas Mitchell.
Property: a sliver of land along Mill Creek, immediately southwest of The Woodlands. Despite its size (too small to merit mention in the deed), the parcel held strategic importance. It spanned the creek and came with the right to build a tide lock "of such width as to admit Sloops to enter."
Price: $2,500.
Source: Deed Book S.H.F. v. 11, p. 347 and following.

11 July 1840, Ann Kittera to Thomas Mitchell
Property: 3/8 of the Woodlands tract.
Price: $41,437.50
Source: deed in WCCC, also recorded 20 October 1849 in Deed Book G.W.C. v. 29, p. 53 and following.
Note: through this timely exchange, Mitchell managed to re-purchase Thomas Kittera's share of The Woodlands, allowing trustees to take title to the entire property for cemetery purposes (see below). However, no money changed hands. Instead, Kittera's executrix accepted seven of thirty shares into which anticipated profits from the cemetery were divided. From this circumstance and other complications surrounding the settlement of Kittera's estate, a series of lawsuits arose, ultimately requiring resolution before the State Supreme Court.[6]

13 July 1840, Thomas Mitchell and wife Maria to Benjamin G. Mitchell.
Property: all 91.5 acres of The Woodlands as well as the Mill Creek tract. The deed was made with the understanding that Benjamin Mitchell would promptly transfer the property to four trustees. They were obliged to "divide the said Tract of land and premises…into Lots Parts and Parcels with such ways Passages and Streets as they may see fit and bargain sell and dispose of the same by public sales or private contracts for the greatest and best prices that can or may be reasonably had." These plans dovetailed with those of the Woodlands Cemetery Company, incorporated in April of the same year. However, no mention of the company appears in the deed.
Price: (nominal)
Source: Deed Book G.S. v. 28, p. 149 and following.

13 July 1840, Benjamin G. Mitchell to Garrick Mallery, Samuel Edwards, Eli K. Price and Thomas Mitchell, in trust.
Property: the above two tracts.
Price: (nominal)

---

[6] Kittera's Estate, 17 Pa. 416 (Sup. Ct. Penna. 1851). I am grateful to Donna Rilling for pointing me to this case and for general assistance with legal sources.

Source: Deed Book G.S. v. 28, p. 151 and following.
Note: This deed of trust accompanied a formal agreement (G.S. v. 28, p. 154 and following) whereby the trustees pledged to subdivide and sell the land in their charge. The profits were to be split into thirty equal shares and distributed proportionately among shareholders. At eleven shares, Thomas Mitchell held the greatest stake, followed distantly by Eli K. Price (four shares). Although Ann Kittera was not listed here, seven shares were soon reassigned to her.

3 June 1843, Garrick Mallery and other Trustees to Woodlands Cemetery Company of Philadelphia.
Property: 75 acres of The Woodlands tract. The Trustees retained the Mill Creek tract and The Woodlands' riverfront, agreeing not to build any structure on the latter rising more than 35 feet above the high tide line without written permission from the cemetery company. The deed also recites the company's charter and recent resolution to issue 600 shares of stock. Each of the 1/30th or "trust" shares established in 1840 were now worth 18 shares of company stock.
Price: (nominal)
Source: Deed Book R.L.L v. 37, p. 139 and following.

17 August 1853, Woodlands Cemetery Company, Garrick Mallery and Eli K. Price (surviving trustees) to Robert Irwin.
Property: approximately 11 acres, drawn mostly from the riverfront parcel but also from cemetery company land. Irwin made the purchase on behalf of the West Chester and Philadelphia Rail Road as a right-of-way for its tracks, though this plan goes unmentioned in the deed.
Price: $22,000 to Trustees and $1,500 to Cemetery Company
Source: Deed Book T.H. v. 103, p. 331 and following.

1 October 1854, Garrick Mallery and Eli K. Price (surviving trustees) to Woodlands Cemetery Company.
Property: remaining fragments of The Woodlands tract, i.e., those not previously sold to the cemetery company or to Irwin.
Price: (nominal)
Source: Deed Book T.H. 173, p. 549 and following.

17 April 1867, Nathaniel B. Browne and wife Emily, Eli K. Price, William H. Moore and wife Hannah to Woodlands Cemetery Company.
Property: a triangular piece of ground near the southwestern corner of the cemetery.
Source: deed in WCCC.
Note: the cemetery company obtained this small parcel for use as a quarry, as discussed in the Managers Minutes, 5 March, 2 April, 7 May 1867.

22 January 1930, Woodlands Cemetery Company to City of Philadelphia
Property: 0.8042 acres at the southeast corner of the site, condemned by City ordinance of this date to make way for University Avenue.
Source: *Plan of University Avenue from the Schuylkill River to Vintage Avenue and Vintage Avenue from University Avenue to 34th Street, 27th Ward, City of Philadelphia, Prepared for the Use of the Board of View in the Matter of the Opening Thereof Under Ordinances Approved Jan. 22 1930 and March 19 1931*, George F. Shegog, Regulator and Surveyor, 11 District, Nov. 19 1935, WCCC.

26 December 1933, Woodlands Cemetery Company to City of Philadelphia
Property: 3.9891 acres along the east side of the site, condemned by City ordinance of this date to make way for University Avenue. Excluding fragmentary parcels east of the avenue, the cemetery property encompassed 67.8282 acres after the taking.
Source: untitled, undated plan of land taken by the City for the bed of University Avenue, brownline, WCCC.

1947, Woodlands Cemetery Company to [U.S. Veterans Administration]
Property: 14.7841 acres along the eastern side of the site. The U.S. Government condemned this land as a site for a Veterans Administration Hospital. This taking left the cemetery with 53.0441 acres.
Source: *Veterans Administration Hospital, Philadelphia, PA, 1000 Bed G. M. Property Map*, War Department Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District, for V. A. Project No. 2871, approved 1 January 1947, WCCC.

15 February 1955, Woodlands Cemetery Company to City of Philadelphia
Property: a strip of ground along cemetery's southern border, condemned as a right-of-way for a sewer line to the Southwest Sewage Treatment Works. The taking displaced graves in Sections N and L.
Source: *Plan Made for the Use of the Board of Viewers Showing the Property of the Woodlands Cemetery Co. 27th Ward Philadelphia in the Matter of the Construction, Improvement, Extension and Equipment of the Southwest Sewage Treatment Works Authorized by Ordinance of Council Approved August 14, 1946*, Dayton F. Stout, Surveyor and Regulator for the Seventh District, 19 May 1955; annotated blueprints of same; both sources in WCCC.

3. Landscape architects, designers, builders, contractors, suppliers:

a) The Woodlands estate:

William Hamilton was Philadelphia's gentleman horticulturist par excellence during the Early National period. To classify him as a landscape gardener let alone as a landscape architect would be misleading. These terms correspond to evolving stages of a profession to which Hamilton did not belong and which hardly existed in America during his lifetime. Rather, he and his class peers – men such as Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, and their counterparts among

the English elite – aspired to be "amateurs in the original sense of the word: lovers of literature and the arts and sciences. They were students of the classics, travelers abroad and connoisseurs of painting, sculpture, and architecture."[7] This, at least, was the ideal, achieved to varying degrees (Washington never crossed the Atlantic).

Members of this coterie typically familiarized themselves with recent treatises on garden design – luxury goods in a budding consumer society. Washington, for instance studied the advice of Batty Langley, while Thomas Jefferson and William Hamilton knew Whately's *Observations on Modern Gardening* (1770) and had the book on hand while visiting England.[8] Contemporaries recognized Hamilton's expertise. At a time when Philadelphia led the nation in cultural and scientific endeavor, his command of horticulture, site planning, and construction led even his most learned correspondents to seek out his advice and approval.[9]

Born into Philadelphia's "proprietary gentry," Hamilton was the nephew of a colonial governor and grandson of lawyer-statesman Andrew Hamilton, remembered principally for defending freedom of the press in the trial of John Peter Zenger.[10] William studied law at the College of Philadelphia (later the University of Pennsylvania) and started managing his extensive properties on reaching maturity. That he would be drawn to 'rural pursuits' was hardly surprising: other members of the local elite, including his grandfather, had built grand houses and gardens outside the city for two generations. However, his trip to England of 1784-86 was decisive in determining the particular outcome of this impulse. In September, 1785, Hamilton wrote to his friend Dr. Thomas Parke: "the verdure of England is its greatest Beauty & my endeavors shall not be wanting to give the Woodlands some resemblance to it."[11]

Hamilton's sojourn was a turning point in his landscape-related thought but modern understanding of the episode remains impressionistic. Letters show, for instance, that he visited Buckinghamshire, Wiltshire, Oxfordshire, Hertfordshire and a host of other counties known for their landscape gardens, but what he saw

---

[7] Elizabeth Barlow Rogers, *Landscape Design: A Cultural and Architectural History* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2001), 234.

[8] Robert F. Dalzell, Jr., and Lee Baldwin Dalzell, *George Washington's Mount Vernon: At Home in Revolutionary America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 58-60; John Dixon Hunt and Peter Willis, eds., *The Genius of the Place: The English Landscape Garden 1620-1820* (Cambridge [MA]: MIT Press, 1988), 333; Ann Leighton, *American Gardens of the Nineteenth Century: "For Comfort and Affluence"* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1987), 147-148; Timothy Preston Long, "The Woodlands: A 'Matchless Place'," (M.S. thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1991), 32.

[9] A concise overview of Hamilton's place in the history of Early National landscape design is: Karen Madsen, "To Make His Country Smile: William Hamilton's Woodlands," *Arnoldia* 49, no. 2 (Spring 1989): 14-24. The most thorough treatment remains Timothy Long's thesis (above). I have drawn on Long's work and generous assistance throughout this report.

[10] For Hamilton's biography and its socio-economic context, see Jacobs, 42-56.

[11] Hamilton to Parke, 24 September 1785, Ferdinand Dreer Coll., HSP, as quoted in Long, "Woodlands," 69. Hereafter, William Hamilton will be cited as **WH**.

there and what he made of it are unrecorded.[12] Did he inspect Rousham, Stowe, and Stourhead? Any answer must remain speculative for now. Nonetheless, two crucial insights may be gleaned from the record. First, Hamilton filtered his travel experience through the language and imagery of "picturesque" theory, especially as distilled by Thomas Whately.[13] Second, what he saw persuaded him to pursue similar results at The Woodlands. In an oft-quoted letter to his steward, Hamilton declared, "Having observed with attention the nature, variety & extent of the plantations of shrubs, trees, & fruits & consequently admired them, I shall (if God grants me a safe return to my own country) endeavor to make it smile in the same useful and beautiful manner."[14] This plan matured over the next five years. Reworking his house in the latest English fashion, Hamilton also created a landscape widely recognized for its artistic and horticultural sophistication.

Historians sometimes argue that The Woodlands represented "the prime example of the Reptonian style outside of England."[15] Formal evidence seems to support the claim. As Timothy Long has noted,

> The flower borders, walks and oval beds devoted to exotics, demonstrated Hamilton's use of decorative and ornamental effects close to his dwelling, effects which mirrored the recommendations published by Humphrey Repton in *Sketches and Hints* (1794) and *Theory and Practice* (1803).[16]

The problem, of course, is that both canonical texts postdate the major phase of Hamilton's project. Working within the standard framework, scholars are forced to conclude that The Woodlands was 'proto-Reptonian' or otherwise 'ahead of its time.' In fact, Hamilton's accomplishment might be better understood as a synthesis of recent and not-so-recent gardening ideas distilled from an array of English sources. The use of a gently rolling lawn punctuated by clumps of trees and framed by belts and screens drew on ideas most often associated with Lancelot "Capability" Brown. Together they created the "expressive" effect extolled by Whately and conspicuous displayed in the English countryside at the time of Hamilton's tour.[17] On the other hand, Hamilton's penchant for oval-shaped exotics beds planted in a tapering formation suggests his familiarity with

---

[12] WH to Parke, 2 November 1785, Ferdinand Dreer Coll., HSP, quoted in Long, "Woodlands," 97-98, 101.
[13] Hamilton's copy of Whately's *Observations* (third edition, 1771), bears his name and the date 1785, indicating that he bought the volume while abroad; his annotations in it may date from this period. See Long, "Woodlands," 393-394, notes 107 and 115.
[14] WH to Benjamin H. Smith, 30 September 1785, Dr. George Smith Coll., HSP. Hereafter, Smith will be cited as **BHS**.
[15] Therese O'Malley, "Landscape Gardening in the Early National Period" in Edward J. Nygren and Bruce Robertson, eds., *Views and Visions: American Landscape before 1830* (Washington: Corcoran Gallery of Art, 1986), 141-142.
[16] Long, "Woodlands," 52.
[17] John Dixon Hunt, *Gardens and the Picturesque: Studies in the History of Landscape Architecture* (Cambridge [MA]: MIT Press, 1992), 75-76; Hunt and Willis, 34-38.

older gardening techniques lately revisited by Nathaniel Swinden.[18] And for all features traceable to a single text or theorist, there were as many derived from mainstream or anonymous vocabularies.

That William Hamilton was the principal creative force behind the design of his grounds has never been seriously disputed. Unlike his mansion, which likely benefited from professional influence at some stage of its conception, the layout of the landscape fell within Hamilton's competence and was the sort of project colonial estate owners frequently undertook.[19] Nonetheless, an alternative attribution to George Isham Parkyns occasionally surfaces in scholarly literature.[20] Landscape historian Eleanor McPeck advanced this claim in a 1973 article conflating artist William Birch's fleeting description of The Woodlands with her own observation that the site resembled a design published by Parkyns.[21] Again, chronology is the stumbling block, since the English landscape gardener did not arrive in the United States until 1794. It is true that Parkyns enjoyed at least one commission along the Schuylkill, Robert Griffith's Eaglesfield (1798).[22] Nonetheless, the chances of his being employed by Hamilton are remote at best.

Although the guiding hand was Hamilton's, his artistic endeavors should not be studied in isolation from either his scientific interests or the managerial techniques he employed while running one large farm and gathering income from others. For while English gentry distanced themselves from "the minutiae of estate administration" in the late eighteenth century, their American counterparts remained actively involved in such matters.[23] Botanist and dilettante, Hamilton was likewise a scientific farmer and a landlord.

For the similar reasons, he cannot be said to have acted alone. Rather, he relied on a large workforce, hierarchical in structure yet susceptible to change. Like the first and third Presidents, he had strong notions about the proper appearance and

---

[18] Mark Laird, *The Flowering of the Landscape Garden: English Pleasure Grounds, 1720–1800* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), 331.

[19] Elizabeth McLean, "Town and Country Gardens in Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia" in Robert P. Maccubbin and Peter Martin, eds., *British and American Gardens in the Eighteenth Century* (Williamsburg, Virginia: The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1984), 139.

[20] For instance, Frederick Doveton Nichols and Ralph E. Griswold, *Thomas Jefferson, Landscape Architect* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1981), 87, 89. Richard J. Betts challenged the attribution in "The Woodlands," *Winterthur Portfolio* 14, no. 3 (Autumn 1979): 226, fn. 34, but James D. Kornwolf revived it in "The Picturesque in the American Garden and Landscape before 1800," in Maccubbin and Martin, 105, n. 40.

[21] Eleanor M. McPeck, "George Isham Parkyns: Artist and Landscape Architect, 1749–1820," *Quarterly Journal of the Library of Congress* 30, no. 3 (July 1973): 178. The design in question is Parkyns' proposal for "Belmont," published as an appendix to Sir John Soane's *Sketches in Architecture* (1793).

[22] The most recent scholarship on Parkyns appears in Kathleen A. Foster, *Captain Watson's Travels in America: The Sketchbooks and Diary of Joshua Rowley Watson, 1772–1818*, with commentaries on the plates by Kenneth Finkel (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997), 40-46. See also Eleanor McPeck's entries in William Howard Adams, ed., *The Eye of Thomas Jefferson* (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1976), 320, 328.

[23] Tom Williamson, "The Landscape Park: Economics, Art and Ideology," *Journal of Garden History* 13, nos. 1-2 (Spring-Summer 1993): 49-50; contrast Long, "Woodlands," 119.

operation of his estate but was often obliged to dictate from afar. This meant that responsibility for realizing his plan fell largely to his steward, Benjamin H. Smith. Hamilton's detailed instructions, sent first from London and then typically from Lancaster, Pennsylvania, where Hamilton owned land, testify to Smith's horticultural ability and to his patience.[24] Below Smith in the chain of command was George Hilton, an indentured African-American servant turned paid gardener. And below Hilton were domestics such as "Conrod," "Mawe," and an array of field laborers who circulated between Hamilton's Woodlands and Bush Hill properties.[25] By the early nineteenth century, gardening at the Woodlands was becoming more specialized. Those who oversaw these operations were (white) seedsmen, nurserymen, and botanists-for-hire whose careers eventually led elsewhere. Among them were European émigrés John Lyon, Frederick Pursh, and John McArran, all subjects of modern scholarship.[26]

Finally, The Woodlands grew from what Elizabeth McLean has called Philadelphia's "horticultural base."[27] When Hamilton boasted that "there was not a rare plant in Europe, Asia, Africa, from China and the islands in the South Sea, of which he had any account, which he had not procured," he was referring to a collection that could only have been amassed through a transatlantic network of botanists and nurserymen.[28] The web's local origins lay largely in the endeavors of John Bartram. Through his English collaborator, cloth merchant Peter Collinson, Bartram sold American seeds to a host of aristocratic patrons.[29] By the late eighteenth century, Hamilton himself had joined this fraternity. Procuring plants for

---

[24] Selections from these documents appear in Benjamin H. Smith, "Some Letters from William Hamilton, of The Woodlands, to his Private Secretary," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 29, nos. 1-3 (1905): 70-78, 143-159, 257-267. Subsequent quotations from the Hamilton – Smith correspondence are drawn from this series unless otherwise noted.

[25] Joseph and Nesta Ewan, "John Lyon, Nurseryman and Plant Hunter, and His Journal, 1799–1814," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 53, no. 2 (1963): 7; Long, "Woodlands," 74, 118-121. Long's is the only extended discussion of Hamilton's managerial practices. Much work remains to be done in this area, for which the Dalzells' chapters 6-8 might serve as a model. Among Hamilton's letters, those to Smith of 30 September 1785 and 16 February 1788 are especially suggestive.

[26] Joseph and Nesta Ewan, "John Lyon," 6-8; Joseph Ewan, "Frederick Pursh, 1774–1820, and His Botanical Associates," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 96, no. 5 (October 1952): 603-605; John W. Harshberger, *The Botanists of Philadelphia and Their Work* (Philadelphia: Press of T. C. Davis & Sons, 1899), 113-114, 133; *From Seed to Flower: Philadelphia 1681-1876, A Horticultural Point of View* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania Horticultural Society, 1976), 23, 114; Townsend Ward, "A Walk to Darby," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 3, no. 2 (1879): 165; Frederick Pursh, *Flora Americae Septentrionalis; or A Systematic Arrangement and Description of the Plants of North America* (London: White, Cochrane and Co., 1814), 1: viii-ix; Long, "Woodlands," 161-163, 415 (n. 186).

[27] McLean, 144.

[28] Manasseh Cutler to Mrs. Torrey, 22 November 1803, as reproduced in "Visit of Manasseh Cutler to William Hamilton at the Woodlands," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 8 (1884): 110.

[29] Alan W. Armstrong, "John Bartam and Peter Collinson: A Correspondence of Science and Friendship" and John Edmondson, "John Bartram's Legacy in Eighteenth-Century Botanical Art: The Knowsley Ehrets" in Nancy E. Hoffmann and John C. Van Horne, eds., *America's Curious Botanist: A Tercentennial Reappraisal of John Bartram 1699–1777* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2004), 23-42, 143-148; Laird, *Flowering*, 69-78; O'Malley, 133-135; *From Seed to Flower*, 17-26; Joseph Ewan, "Philadelphia Heritage: Plants and People" in George H. M. Lawrence, ed., *America's Garden Legacy: A Taste for Pleasure*, (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania Horticultural Society, 1978), 1-2.

such neighbors as John Penn, Jr., while abroad and communicating with an international array of botanists at home, he commanded intellectual and natural resources on a staggering scale. Commercial venues also factored in the equation. The nursery run by John Bartram, Jr., regularly furnished Hamilton with exotics, and study of Hamilton's plant lists points to a number of other suppliers.[30]

b) Woodlands Cemetery:

If many hands were responsible for creating The Woodlands, credit for the main conception still rests with William Hamilton. Woodlands Cemetery defies such straightforward attribution. Working with topography whose associations they wished to preserve, cemetery managers established a new template that suited their needs and that was re-shaped, in turn, by groups and individuals who purchased lots. This last sort of alteration will be analyzed in a subsequent section of the report. More discrete and better documented, the cemetery company's contribution to the landscape is the immediate focus.

The adaptation of a private eighteenth-century estate into a commercial cemetery required a vast array of skills: legal, political, financial, administrative, technical, and artistic. Of the original "corporators" who shouldered these burdens, it was the brothers Eli K. and Philip M. Price who were most directly responsible for refitting the grounds. Their strengths in this regard differed considerably.

Eli Price (1797–1884) was a prominent real estate lawyer.[31] Once involved with the cemetery, he turned an amateur interest in horticulture into a part-time vocation and became the company's leading manager. Law also led Price in other directions. A proponent of municipal reform, he served in the state legislature (1854–1856) and helped formulate the 1854 act that consolidated the City of Philadelphia. The final synthesis of his legal skills and commitment to pastoral urbanism came late in life. Starting in 1867, he oversaw land acquisitions for the expanding Fairmount Park and established the Oak Grove there.

The 1840 city directory listed Philip Price (1802–1870) simply as "surveyor."[32] That title, however, belied a complicated line of work arrived at circuitously.

---

[30] WH to BHS, [3] October 1789, [?] June 1790, 12 June 1790; Joseph and Nesta Ewan, "John Lyon," 6-7; *From Seed to Flower*, 37; Long, "Woodlands," 96.

[31] For brief biographies of Eli K. Price see J. Smith Futhey and Gilbert Cope, *History of Chester County, Pennsylvania, with Genealogical and Biographical Sketches* (Philadelphia: Louis H. Everts, 1881), 696-699; and *Dictionary of American Biography*, Dumas Malone, ed., (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935). On Price's role at Woodlands Cemetery, see Long, "Woodlands," 196-318.

[32] There are no published biographies of Philip M. Price. This sketch is based on: McElroy's Philadelphia Directory for 1840; two obituaries, lacking original citations, in the clipping files of the Chester County Historical Society, West Chester, Pa. (hereafter **CCHS**); "Philip M. Price," an anonymous typescript in the archives of the Clinton County Historical Society, Lock Haven, Pennsylvania; Josephine Mirabella Elliott, ed., *Partnership for Posterity: The Correspondence of William Maclure and Marie Duclos Fretageot, 1820-1833* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1994), 1067-1077. Hereafter, Eli K. Price will be cited as **EKP** and Philip M. Price as **PMP**.

Like his older brother William, Philip studied medicine in Philadelphia, eventually attending the University of Pennsylvania. Much taken with Robert Owen's utopian socialism, he moved to New Harmony, Indiana, in 1825 only to depart, disillusioned, a year later. Surveying then became his adopted line of work. In partnership with Joseph Fox, he laid out the Spring Garden neighborhood of Philadelphia and took on private commissions as well. Among the latter were the city's first "rural" cemeteries: Laurel Hill (1836), Monument (1837) and Woodlands (1840).[33]

Price's cemetery style is hard to categorize. Combining geometrical and naturalistic elements, it owed something to Humphrey Repton and John Claudius Loudon, as well as to architect H. E. Kendall's designs for Kensal Green Cemetery near London.[34] Surveying in its modern sense connotes a rote technical exercise. Price practiced something broader, including areas of expertise later found among the professions of landscape architect, urban planner, and real estate developer. These aptitudes guided his later work in Lock Haven, Pennsylvania, where he had invested heavily in land. Arriving in 1861, he laid out and planted Price's Addition, which "practically doubled the area of Lock Haven's residential section."[35]

What the Prices gave Woodlands Cemetery was a landscape framework, ready for further adaptation. Philip determined the road system and handled other surveying needs with help from several assistants. (After an 1844 dispute with the board, he was succeeded by Edward D. Roberts).[36] Final say over the site's appearance resided with the company's Executive Committee, of which Eli Price was the most active member. His efforts focused on plantings but also included attention to infrastructure and general conditions; a day spent analyzing soil samples suggests his range of duties.[37]

The design of individual sections might fall to the company's principal surveyor or be or contracted out to others. Early on, shareholders' personal stakes in the land were decisive. Thus Section F, which corresponded to stock owned by corporator Thomas Mitchell, was designed by his architect of choice, Thomas U. Walter, while more broadly held sections C, D, and E were laid out by Philip Price and Edward Roberts.[38] In time, though, all ground was treated as company property. It was the board, and not an individual, that hired "rural architect" J. C. Sidney as the master planner for Sections K, L, and M in the 1860s.

---

[33] In his report of 18 February 1843, Philip Price informed Woodlands Cemetery managers that his design for their grounds benefited from "the practical experience [he] had obtained in designing and laying out the Laurel Hill and Monument Cemeteries." The managers then placed this letter on the record; see Managers of Woodlands Cemetery, 25 February 1843, WCCC (Managers Minutes hereafter).

[34] Kensal Green influenced the design of Laurel Hill, usually attributed to John Notman. See Aaron Wunsch, "Laurel Hill Cemetery," HABS No. PA-1811 (1999), pp. 18-19.

[35] "Philip M. Price," 3.

[36] Managers Minutes, 2 December 1843 – 27 September 1844.

[37] Executive Committee Minutes of the Woodlands Cemetery Company, 23 May 1846, WCCC (hereafter Executive Committee Minutes)

[38] Ibid., 13 April, 27 September, 12 October 1844, 2 June, 1 December 1846.

As the cemetery developed, long-term employees and seasonal laborers maintained the grounds. Superintendent Robert Devine served from 1843 until 1857, when he was succeeded by Joseph James.[39] Gardener William Carvill arrived in 1844 and was evicted six years later.[40] Late nineteenth-century payrolls preserve the names of men who performed routine mowing and pruning.

The company's architects, surveyors, builders, and suppliers were so numerous that their contributions are best summarized in list form. The following tally focuses on years 1843-1863, the two decades covered by company receipt books. Data outside of this range are incomplete and are included more selectively.

Architects

Associated with cemetery buildings and infrastructure:

* Thomas U. Walter: "design for altering the front of Woodlands Cemetery" (1842); plan for Section F (1846).[41]

* John Notman: was "requested to furnish a plan for the consideration of the board for an iron gateway for the Cemetery" (1844).[42] The result is unclear.

* John McArthur, Jr.: design for new entrance gate (1854).[43]

* Paul Philippe Cret / Harbeson Hough Livingston & Larson: design for new entrance gate and supervision of construction (1936–1937); modification of gate supports (1939); entrance relocation drawings (1948).[44]

---

[39] Receipt Books of the Woodlands Cemetery Company, 20 September–4 November 1843, WCCC (hereafter Receipt Books); Managers Minutes, 10 March, 20 July 1857.
[40] Managers Minutes, 12 October 1844, 4 February 1850.
[41] Thomas U. Walter, Account Book, 15 November 1842; Diary, 15–16 November 1842, 22 June – 3 July, 1846; both sources in the Thomas U. Walter Coll., Athenaeum of Philadelphia. The nature of the first commission is unclear. Thomas Mitchell paid Walter $20 for the design, perhaps a proposal for remodeling Hamilton's gatehouses to reflect their new function. The managers authorized the second project on 2 June 1846 (Managers Minutes) and made the final payment on 25 July 1848 (Receipt Books).
[42] Managers Minutes, 12 September 1844. It is unclear if the iron gate the Managers agreed to purchase on 8 November 1844 (Managers Minutes) conformed to Notman's design.
[43] McArthur's design was selected on 5 June 1854 (Managers Minutes); McArthur received payment of $100 on 26 July 1854 (Receipt Books).
[44] The company's contract with Cret appears to be lost. The earliest dated drawing is marked 20 March 1936, Paul Philippe Cret Coll., Athenaeum of Philadelphia (hereafter **PPCC**). Cret received final payment on 5 February 1937 as noted in "Woodlands Cemetery Company, Construction Costs–New Gate," TMs, WCCC. Drawings for new gate post braces and cross bar ends are dated 2 and 12 December 1939, PPCC. Drawings for the relocation are dated 15 October 1948 and revised 3 December 1848, PPCC.

Associated with individual monuments:

* Collins & Autenrieth (attributed): Francis M. Drexel mausoleum (1863; L-22).[45]

* John Kutts: William H. Moore monument (by 1868; D-33).[46]

* Wilson Brothers & Company: Thomas W. Evans Mausoleum (1901; M-6).[47]

Landscape Architects

* James C. Sidney: plan for "proposed New Sections" (K, L, M) and report assessing cemetery's overall design and condition (1866).[48]

* Wheelwright, Stevenson & Langran: remedial planting plan for the cemetery focusing on eastern boundary (1957); revisions to same (1963, 1965).[49]

Surveyors

* Philip M. Price: survey of site followed by survey and staking of carriage roads (1839–1840); "draft or plan" of cemetery (ca. 1841–1842); preliminary plans for Center Circle and Section E (by 1844); laying out Section C (1844).[50]

* Edward D. Roberts: surveying in Sections C, D, E, G and Center Circle (1844–1847); surveying West Gate / West Mansion Avenue (1845); unspecified work (1848–1853).[51]

---

[45] The firm prepared at least two designs for the mausoleum but neither of the surviving proposals depicts the final product; see *Philadelphia Architects and Buildings Project* (online), s.v. "Collins, Edward;" drawing in Collins & Autenrieth Architectural Works, University of Delaware Library, Special Coll.; photograph in General Coll., Athenaeum of Philadelphia.

[46] Kutts' name appears in *The Charter, By-Laws, and Regulations of the Woodlands Cemetery Company. With a List of Lot Holders, to March 1, 1868* (Philadelphia: Collins, pr., 1868), illustration facing p. 24.

[47] *Philadelphia Real Estate Record and Builders' Guide* 16, no. 36 (4 September 1901): 573, and no. 42 (16 October 1901): 671.

[48] Managers Minutes, 5 June 1866. Only the plan for Section K is now clearly identifiable as Sidney's, though he may well have influenced the designs for the other two sections.

[49] Set of blueprints dated 24 May 1957 with revisions on 15 April 1963, 12 Dec 1963, 10 May 1965, filed with related bids and correspondence, WCCC.

[50] Although Philip Price was not officially named surveyor until 13 July 1840 (Managers Minutes), he had been on the job since 1839 (PMP report to WCC Managers, 30 December 1843, WCCC). The earliest dated lithograph of Price's plan shows preliminary schemes for Center Circle and Section E ("Release of Mortgage, Peter Bousquet to Woodlands Cemetery Company," 19 April 1844, recorded 30 January 1845, WCCC). Price's last assignment was laying out the area that would become Section C according to a plan that may or may not have been his own (Managers Minutes, 13 April 1844). Since his conflict with the company occurred at this time, it is possible he delegated the task to Edward Roberts.

[51] "Bill Rendered Dec. 29/[18]52 Edwd. D. Roberts" for work performed March 1844–May 1847, WCCC. Roberts was the managers' choice for laying out the area that would become Section E (Managers Minutes, 27 September 1844), and seems to have taken over Section C from Price (Receipt Books, 29 November 1844). He had minor involvement with Section D, a.k.a. the St. Andrew's allotment (12 Oct 1844,

* Francis Lightfoot / Lightfoot & Walton: surveying and laying out Section I, re-surveying Section F (1851–1852); surveying "river front" sold to West Chester & Philadelphia R. R. (1853); surveying and laying out courtyard for new carriage sheds (1854); surveying and laying out Center Circle (1856); surveying, laying out, and plan for Section H (1858); plan for Section L (1873).[52]

* Fowler & Lummis, laying out Section M (1878).[53]

General Contractors

* Steel Building Construction Company: building new entrance gate, driveway, and sidewalk (1936–1937).[54]

Masons, Stonecutters, Marble Workers

Associated with cemetery buildings and infrastructure:

* Dennis Kennedy: cemetery walls (1843–1846).[55]

* John Keech: bridge (presumably over Middle Run) and receiving vault (1840–1841); unspecified work (1854); superintending wall construction along cemetery's southern border (1866).[56]

* Lloyd & Keany: granite and granite work for entrance gate (ca. 1844–1845).[57]

Managers Minutes) and, perhaps, with an early plan for Section F (Managers Minutes 4 November 1845). He also laid out West Gate / West Mansion Avenue (Executive Committee Minutes, 30 January 1845). The last payment to Roberts was on 28 February 1853 (Receipt Books).

[52] Lightfoot's first work at the cemetery, recorded 1 April 1851, was for the Sixth Presbyterian Church [Section I] (Receipt Books). He then worked on Sections I and F (loose bills, 3 October 1851, 9 March 1852, 18 March 1852, WCCC; Receipt Books 21 February 1852, 17 April 1852; Managers Minutes, 7 October 1851, 6 April 1852), the "river front" sold to the railroad (loose bill, n.d. [1853], WCCC; Receipt Books, 9 July 1853, 8 December 1853), the carriage shed courtyard (Receipt Books, 1 November 1854), Center Circle (Receipt Books, 27 December 1856), and Section H (loose bill, 5 April 1858, WCCC). His last project was "a Plan for the New Section L," (Managers Minutes, 2 September 1873).

[53] Managers Minutes, 2 July 1878; the unsigned 1878 plan for this section is probably theirs.

[54] Contract between Woodlands Cemetery Company and Steel Building Construction Company, prepared by Paul Cret, 7 June 1936, WCCC. Final payment delivered on 5 February 1937 as noted in "Woodlands Cemetery Company, Construction Costs–New Gate," TMs, WCCC.

[55] Duration of work: 14 June 1843 (Executive Committee Minutes), through 3 November 1846 (Receipt Books).

[56] "Eli K. Price's claim agt. The Woodlands," n.d., WCCC, indicates Price paid Keech $106 for "building bridge" on 13 January 1841. Price presented his claim on 4 September 1843 (Managers Minutes). The company paid Keech $53.23 on 13 October 1843 for "constructing a receiving vault" (Receipt Books). However, Keech's bill, dated 19 August 1843, WCCC, is for work completed 12 November 1840 and 9 June 1841. Unspecified work is listed in the Receipt Books, 16 October 1854. The contract for the southern wall was announced in the Managers Minutes, 6 March 1866.

[57] Receipt Books, 1 February 1845.

* William Keay: coping on Darby Road/Woodland Avenue wall (1852); coping on unspecified "wall round the cemetery" (1853).[58]

* Abraham Childs: repairs to Darby Road/Woodland Avenue wall (1852).[59]

* George McCrea: ditto (1853).[60]

* Basil Wall: ditto (1853).[61]

* William & J. Waterhouse: marble and marble work on receiving vault (1853).[62]

* John Fleech[?]: unspecified stone work, probably for "courtyard"/new carriage sheds (1855).[63]

* John M. DuShane, general stonework for new entrance (1855–1857).[64]

* Solomon K. Hoxie: granite and granite work for façade of new entrance (1855–1857).[65]

* Barker, Weight & Co.: curb, coping, and related work at new entrance (1857).[66]

Associated with individual monuments (partial list):[67]

* John Baird: Elliott Cresson monument (d. 1854; E [D]-63); Henry McKeen Family monument (date unknown).

* Billings & Co.: Eli K. Price monument (after 1884; C-34).

* H. Q. French: Delaplaine McDaniel Mausoleum (1887).[68]

---

[58] Receipt Books, 24 July – 26 November 1852, 23 December 1853.
[59] Receipt Books, 4 August 1852.
[60] Receipt Books, 7 February 1853.
[61] Receipt Books, 8 November 1853,
[62] Receipt Books, 29 November 1853.
[63] Receipt Book, 8 February 1855.
[64] The first payment to DuShane was on 25 May 1855, the last on 8 January 1858 (Receipt Books); work had apparently ceased some time since.
[65] The Managers accepted Hoxie's bid on 21 February 1855 (Managers Minutes) and furnished his final payment on 20 march 1857 (Receipt Books).
[66] Receipt Books, 27 June 1857.
[67] The list is based on an informal field survey in which makers' names were spotted on monuments. Death dates are an unreliable guide to construction dates; the latter are supplied where possible.
[68] [J. Sergeant Price], Report from Managers to Corporators for the Year 1887 (10 January 1888), WCCC.

* John M. Gessler: William B. Snyder monument (d. 1877); Theodore G. Wormley monument (d. 1897); Robert H. and Amelia P. Driver monument (Amelia d. 1889).

* Edwin Greble: William and Eliza Griffin monument (date unknown); Admiral Charles Stewart monument (1871; L-24)[69]; William Worrel monument (date unknown).

* Thomas Hargrave: Joshua and Jane Tevis monument (Joshua d. 1852); Thomas Shivers monument (date unknown), William H. Pearson Family monument, (date unknown); Hezekiah Buzby Family monument (date unknown).

* Malloch & Struthers: Robert Swift monument (d. 1862).

* Joseph Maples: Isabella Frazier monument (date unknown); Lewis P. Gebhard Family monument (date unknown); William P. Hamm Family monument, (date unknown).

* James McClaranan: Commodore David Porter monument (1847; CC-5);[70] James R. Leslie Family monument (date unknown)

* Moore & Waterhouse: Edward A. Orme monument (d. 1849).

* Smith Granite Company: Joseph F. Smith and Harriet L. Hinkle monument (date unknown).

* [Ferdinand H.] Strecker: marble work for Dr. John C. Otto monument (1845; E-7).[71]

* [John or William] Struthers: J. Barlow Reynolds monument (date unknown).

* Van Gunden & Young: William C. Allison Family monument (d. 1891); Benjamin S. and Anne M. Riley monument (Benjamin d. 1870).

* W. J. Waterhouse: Harriet M. Bucknell Family monument (date unknown).

Stained Glass Workers

* John Gibson: "stained glass set in metal windows & transoms at the Mansion House" (i.e. in the saloon during its conversion to a chapel), (1855).[72]

---

[69] EKP, Report from Managers to Corporators for the Year 1871, n.d., WCCC.
[70] Managers Minutes, 7 September 1847; Receipt Books, 6 and 13 September, 27 October 1847 (payments via Michael McCloskey).
[71] Executive Committee Minutes, 1 September 1845.
[72] Loose bill, 14 November 1855, WCCC.

Blacksmiths, Ironworkers, Brass Founders

* P. P. Mingus: making and setting cemetery gates (1845).[73]

* Morris Tasker & Morris: "Cast iron posts at the Cemetery" (1846).[74]

* Joseph Bernhard: two brass bells and hangings (1851).[75]

* Robert Wood / Wood & Perot: "Iron Door for vault, lock, Key, Bolts etc." [apparently for new receiving vault in Center Circle] (1853); gate for new entrance to cemetery (1858); repairs to iron railings (1862).[76]

Plumbers

* Forsyth & Bro.: "leaden pipe, pump, water wheel & work done at the Cemetery" (1853–1854).[77]

Tinsmiths / Roofers

* William S. Bonsall / George Rugan, Jr. / Rugan & Bonsall: work on receiving vault (1853); roof for the "courtyard" / octagonal carriage sheds (1854–1856); roof for new entrance (1856).[78]

Carpenters

* James Leslie: fence-building and miscellaneous repairs (1844–1850).[79]

* Benjamin S. Childs: sheds and privy (1847).[80]

* George W. Cobb: work on receiving vault (1850).[81]

* Thomas Baxter: unspecified work [probably "courtyard" / new carriage sheds] (1855); work on new entrance (1855–1857); fence between cemetery and almshouse (1857).[82]

---

[73] Receipt Books, 1 February and 4 March 1845.
[74] Receipt Books, 25 August 1846.
[75] Receipt Books, 22 May and 7 August 1851.
[76] Managers Minutes, 6 September 1853 ("iron gate" presumably refers to the vault door); Receipt Books 15 September 1853, 26 January 1858 (referring to note of 1 January 1858, pasted in); 24 June 1862.
[77] Receipt Books, 1 November 1853, 14 February 1854.
[78] Receipt Books, 15 October 1853, 15 November 1854, 9 April 1855, 5 July and 11 December 1856.
[79] Contract for "palisade fence" let, Managers Minutes, 20 April 1844; final project-related payment recorded in Receipt Books, 31 December 1850.
[80] Receipt Books, 10 July – 25 August 1847.
[81] Receipt Books, 16 February 1850.
[82] Receipt Books, 19 January and 8 February 1855, 21 July 1855 – 3 September 1857, 15 January 1857.

Plasterers

* James Allen & Brother: plastering receiving vault (1854); "hacking & recoating ceilings ref cornice & scraping at Mansion" (1854); unspecified work (1855).[83]

* Joseph Richardson: plastering new entrance lodges (1857).[84]

Bricklayers and Brick Suppliers

* Gill & Moore (1845).[85]

* Albert Hoover (1853).[86]

* Jacob Jarden (1853).[87]

* Robert Leonard (1854).[88]

* James S. Sprague (1854).[89]

* Smith & Sickels (1856).[90]

Stone Suppliers

* John Coulter: paving stones for new entrance (1856).[91]

* William Sweeney: “stone for entrance building” (1856).[92]

Gravel Suppliers

* William McDevitt (1849).[93]

Lime Suppliers

* D. & P. McGarry: lime for new entrance (1855).[94]

---

[83] Loose bills, 2 January and 5 December 1854, WCCC; Receipt Books, 26 January and 9 February 1855.
[84] Receipt Books, 13 March and 11 April 1857.
[85] James Leslie and EKP, Report from Managers to the Corporators for the Year 1845, 3 January 1846, WCCC; Receipt Books 7 March 1846.
[86] Receipt Books, 1 November 1853.
[87] Receipt Books, 29 December 1853.
[88] Receipt Books, 25 January 1854.
[89] Receipt Books, 14 October 1854.
[90] Receipt Books, 9 January 1856.
[91] Receipt Books, 11 June 1856.
[92] Receipt Books, 6 November 1856.
[93] Receipt Books, 20 January 1849.
[94] Receipt Books, 12 October 1855.

Lumber Suppliers

* L.W. Keyser (1845).[95]

* James Renning[?] (1845).[96]

* J. H. McShain, (1847–1848, 1855).[97]

* Joseph S. Keen & Sons (1851).[98]

* John R. Green & Co., (1856–1857).[99]

Nurserymen, Florists, Seedsmen, Landscapers

* John B. Turner: large order of unspecified plant material (1845); "upwards of three hundred trees…of which 164 are balm of gileads" (1846).[100]

* Patrick Kereven: two balm of Gilead trees (1845), two cherokee poplars and "about 1000 trees, nearly all Evergreens, Balms, norway pines, Cyrpress, hemlock, etc.," quantity later revised down to ca. 750 (1846); 24 Balm of Gilead trees (1847).[101]

* "Freeman's": "abt 40 imported shrubs - to be planted near the lodges" (1846).[102]

* H[enry] A. Dreer: seeds (1846).[103]

* Landreth's Nursery / Landreth & Fulton: twelve cypress trees (1847); "10 Balm of Gileads, 10 Chinese arborvite [sic], 5 placata, 5 silver pine, 5 ditto, 5 hemlock spruce, 5 Paulona Imperialis, 6 ashleaved maple, 5 Platarius Orientalis, 5 Flowring [sic] Cherry, 5 Cypress and 5 American Arbor Vitae" (1848).[104]

---

[95] Leslie and EKP, Report for 1845.
[96] Ibid.
[97] Receipt Books, 21 August 1847; 26 January 1848; 1 September 1848; 25 May 1855.
[98] Receipt Books, 2 September 1851.
[99] Receipt Books, 4 December 1856; 14 February 1857; 10 April 1857.
[100] Leslie and EKP, Report for 1845; Executive Committee Minutes, 7 April 1846; Receipt Books, 15 June 1846.
[101] Receipt Books, 8 May 1845, 27 March 1847; Executive Committee Minutes, 18 April, 1-2 May 1846.
[102] Executive Committee Minutes, 18 Apr 1846.
[103] Receipt Books, 16 June 1846.
[104] Receipt Books, 9 July 1847; Executive Committee Minutes, 28 April 1847; 30 March 1848.

* William Carvill: "106 trees…Consisting of silver poplars, varieties of horse chestnut; dark & light sugar maples, silver and ash leaved maples, English and Turkey Oaks, American and English Lindens" as well as "over one hundred" unspecified trees (1848).[105]

* Robert Carr of Bartram's Garden: "three large Balm of Gilead Trees" (1845); "a lot of Shrubbery consisting of a considerable variety and a few trees" (1848); "flowers and shrubs" (1849).[106]

* Robert Buist's Nursery: "ten Balm of Gilead trees and eleven Austrian Firs" (1854).[107]

* David Ferguson: 300 ivy plants (1856).[108]

* Laurel Hill [Cemetery] nursery: unspecified materials (1864).[109]

* J. Franklin Meehan & Sons, Inc.: 118 plants, mostly evergreens, and planting plan for new entrance (1936).[110]

* Henkels & McCoy, Inc.: 242 trees specified in Wheelwright, Stevenson & Langran landscape plan (by1960); proposal for tree removal (1963; likely unexecuted).[111]

* Hansen Brothers Nurseries, Inc.: unspecified number of plants for revised Wheelwright, Stevenson & Langran plan (1965).[112]

---

[105] Receipt Books, 14, 28 April 1848; Executive Committee Minutes, 8 and 12 April 1848.
[106] Receipt Books, 12 May 1845, 4 May 1848, 13 June 1849; Executive Committee Minutes, 10 April 1848; EKP, Report from Executive Committee to Managers for the Year 1848, [No day] January 1849, WCCC.
[107] Loose bill from Robert Devine, 2 May 1854, WCCC; Receipt Books, 16 Dec 1854.
[108] Receipt Books, 6 March 1856.
[109] Managers Minutes, 5 July 1854.
[110] J. Franklin Meehan, Jr., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to Woodlands Cemetery Company, 16 October 1936, WCCC.
[111] Lawrence G. Paglia to George Scholl 10 June 1960; Magnus Stender to George Scholl, 9 July 1863; George Scholl to Eli K. Price III, 18 July 1963; all in WCCC.
[112] Charles W. Pfanstiel to Frederick Hansen, 30 June 1965, WCCC.

B. Periods of Development:

1. Original plans and construction: William Hamilton's Woodlands

Composing a coherent idea of The Woodlands in its early forms is a difficult task. The site evolved significantly during Hamilton's tenure: gardens of the early 1780s lacked features such as the exotics beds and twin hothouses that intrigued visitors from 1790s onward. Written records help explain these developments but, as one recent scholar has noted, "The collection of historic documents relating to the 18th century house and garden…is actually quite small, and most have been known for some time."[113] Still, these documents have much to offer.[114] Reviewing their contents helps dispel some received ideas about the site's place in garden history and permits a sharper focus on the problems that remain.

In April, 1779, William Hamilton wrote to his friend William Tilghman, Jr.,

> I have just been making some considerable Improvements at the Woodlands, and I long to have you see them…. From the scarcity of Fence Nails, High prices and Difficulty of getting Labourers I have been obliged to throw 100 acres on the back of my House, into only one Enclosure which although not inconvenient has never [had a?] handsome Effect. You may recollect the Ground is Hill & Dale Woodland and plain and therefore well enough calculated to make a small park, and I am endeavoring to give it as much as possible a parkish Look. My Lawn too I expect will shine this summer, it already looks elegantly. And so it ought you'll say, when you are told the manuring it this last Winter has cost me L 1500.[115]

This statement, brief as it is, says much about Hamilton's social position, aesthetic ideals, and vision for The Woodlands. In the midst of a wartime economy, he has reluctantly erected a single enclosure around a large tract near his house. He would have preferred to build multiple enclosures, apparently for artistic reasons but perhaps for practical ones as well. The land in question possesses the "hill and dale" topography so valued by contemporary aesthetes.[116] It thus strikes Hamilton as suitable for a park, a landscape type trailed by centuries of Anglo-Saxon associations but acquiring new significance at the onset of the Industrial Revolution.[117] Importantly, this area is also "back of" the house. In keeping with villa-gardening conventions on and beyond the Schuylkill, Hamilton considers the front of the house

---

[113] Joel T. Fry, "The Woodlands: An Archaeological Research and Planning Survey, 1993," prepared for the University City Historical Society (1995), 7.
[114] Fry, 8-20, provides a useful compilation of primary sources which, along with those quoted throughout Long, "Woodlands," and Smith are the basis for much the following analysis.
[115] WH to Tilghman, [no day] April 1779, Society Coll., HSP.
[116] Madsen, 17
[117] Williamson, 49-50; Hunt and Willis, 21; Charles Quest-Ritson, *The English Garden: A Social History* (London: Penguin Books, 2003), 136-144.

to be its river side.[118] Here he is creating a lawn, another staple of the English landscape garden. And, despite the privations of war, he is prepared to invest in a luxury costing more than seven times the annual income of a contemporary skilled laborer to maintain.[119]

The rarefied zone discussed in this passage was part of a larger working landscape extending north and east of the house. Since coming of age in 1766, Hamilton had added 190.5 acres to his estate through gift or purchase, bringing his total holdings there to just under 550 acres at the time of his letter to Tilghman. Over the next two decades, the tract expanded and contracted but never fell below this size. As such, it covered a large swath of what is now West Philadelphia.[120]

Modern understanding of the property's pre-1790 use and appearance comes largely from rental advertisements. One such notice describes "an elegant seat [and two farms with] marsh meadows, fast land, uplands, watered meadows supplied [by] never failing streams, and sundry quarries of stone."[121] The same sources make clear that Hamilton rented most of this land to farmers. The part he set off for his park measured about 100 acres with roughly ten constituting the garden.[122] Hamilton's decision to lease out arable terrain beyond this area may have stemmed from economic or political pressures brought on by the Revolution. A suspected Loyalist who had twice escaped punishment, he advertised "pasture land …[that] would very well suit the town herdsmen."[123] In any case, the parcel on which he lavished time and money was already distinct from its surroundings.

Shortly after Hamilton's letter to Tilghman, a French observer noted: "[Hamilton] can plant enchanted gardens there, and have as beautiful waters as those of Marly, but at less expense. Today it is just a simple English garden, whose master does the honors of it perfectly."[124] The passage suggests Hamilton had taken preliminary steps toward a grand design. Four years later, he may have been further along, for

---

[118] Foster, 44-45, discusses the same orientation at Eaglesfield.
[119] Long, "Woodlands," 85.
[120] See Long, "Woodlands," 70, for a precise description of the estate's boundaries in 1789. See Jacobs, 13-14 and Long, "Woodlands," 82-83, on title history for this period.
[121] "To be Let at The Woodlands," *Pennsylvania Packet*, 9 January 1788, quoted in Long, "Woodlands," 70.
[122] The ten-acre estimate has been handed down by scholars for 150 years. Thus O'Malley, 142, quotes, Kornwolf, 100, who quotes Alice G. B. Lockwood, *Gardens of Colony and State* (New York: Garden Club of America, 1931-1934), 348, who evidently quotes Thompson Westcott, *The Historic Mansions and Buildings of Philadelphia, with some Notice of their Owners and Occupants* (Philadelphia: Porter & Coates, 1877), 424, who quotes an unnamed source from "1830," who closely paraphrases Oliver Oldschool [Joseph Dennie], "American Scenery – for the Port Folio: The Woodlands," *Port Folio* 2, no. 6 (December 1809): 505. It is a reasonable estimate but needs confirmation. As Long suggests ("Woodlands," p. 74), even the land Hamilton rented out probably continued to produce hay, feed, and firewood for his family.
[123] "To be Let (and entered upon immediately)," *Pennsylvania Packet*, 14 May 1782, as quoted in Long, "Woodlands," 87.
[124] François Marquis de Barbé-Marboise, *Our Revolutionary Forefathers: The Letters of François, Marquis de Barbé-Marboise…1779-1785,* trans. and ed. Eugene Parker Chase (New York: Duffield & Co., 1929), 133-134, as quoted in Fry, 8.

physician Johann David Schöpf then characterized The Woodlands (significantly if too selectively) as the only garden near Philadelphia "deserving special mention."[125]

If The Woodlands was recognizably "English" by 1779, it must have seemed mean compared to the estates Hamilton saw while touring England's countryside. His mid-1780s sojourn was a turning point for his garden, triggering an exponential increase in botanical variety. While still in London, he wrote urgently to his steward:

> To take time by the forelock, every preparation should *immediately* be made by Mr. Thompson who is on the spot, & I have no doubt you will assist him to the utmost of your power. The first thing to be set about is a good nursery for trees, shrubs, flowers, fruits &c. of every kind. I do desire therefore that seeds in large quantities may be directly sown of the *white flowering Locust, the sweet or aromatic Birch, the Chestnut Oak, Horse chestnuts, Chincapins, Judas trees, Dogwoods, Hallesia, Kalmias, Rhododendron, Magnolias, winterberries, arrow wood, Broom, annonas, shrub St Johns wort* &c, of crabs, quinces, plums & a quantity of *thin shell'd almonds*, & such others as may occur to you for Beauty or use.[126]

So begins a detailed set of instructions, running to almost three pages. Hamilton lists native and foreign trees, including such species as the Lombardy poplar, which he had recently introduced to America. Vines form their own category, with special emphasis on grapes and honeysuckle. And flowers are crucial, too: "*Yucca, cornflag* (Gladiolus) *lilie, white narcissus (double and single) pinks, double sweet william, Lychnidea, french Honeysuckle, Foxglove, Lily of the Valley* (from Bush Hill), *Paeonies, Columbines, Hollyhocks, polyanthos, Jonquils* (from Bush Hill), *Hyacinths &c.*" This document is the single most comprehensive inventory of plants Hamilton wanted at The Woodlands.[127] It points the way toward a lush and colorful landscape in which use and appearance were carefully considered.

The same litany provides tantalizing glimpses of buildings and topography. Hamilton mentions "the circle or ring that ends in the Ice House Hill" and requests the dimensions "of the walk and of the Ha Ha." There is also a greenhouse standing west of the mansion, a "kitchen garden on the other side of the valley," and now, in keeping with the above instructions, a large nursery.

---

[125] Johann David Schöpf in *Travels in the Confederation, 1783 – 1784,* trans. and ed. Alfred J. Morrison (Philadelphia: William Campbell 1911), 1:93; Mclean, 136, puts the quotation in context.
[126] WH to BHS, 30 September 1785.
[127] While many of the plants listed here were available from local suppliers, Hamilton supplemented them with species he encountered in England. His inquiry after the "300 Silver firs, 500 Portugal Laurels, [and] a great number of Myrtles" he shipped home while travelling suggests the scale of his purchases; WH to BHS, 2 November 1785.

To a limited extent, it is possible to locate these features in today's landscape.[128] Ice House Hill constitutes the highest point in the cemetery, and the eponymous building probably survives underground in much-modified form. The greenhouse, or rather its larger successor, shows up on a mid-nineteenth-century survey and, apparently, in a modern archaeologist's test pits.[129] The kitchen garden seems to have stood somewhere north of the extant stable but south of the orchard. Nonetheless, many details remain elusive. Most visual evidence from the Hamilton era documents the general effect, and does so from a perspective that is literally one-sided.

From the 1790s on, artists traveling through the Delaware Valley considered The Woodlands a worthy subject. Many apparently saw the site an outpost of an English phenomenon and this idea pushed their depictions toward an established 'country-seat' genre. Those who balanced convention with careful observation included James Peller Malcom (1767 – 1815), Joshua Rowley Watson (1772 – 1818), and Pavel Petrovich Svinin (1787/1788 – 1839).[130] Over three decades, these watercolorists showed the estate as contemporaries described it: a porticoed mansion overlooking a lawn that rolls gently toward the Schuylkill. This smooth expanse is bounded to the east by a belt of deciduous trees, the clearest landscape feature in all representations. To the west stands a corresponding belt or clump, descending to shrubs near the water's edge. Individual specimens dot the middle ground but cultivation and openness reign. The only painting from this period to suggest otherwise is William Groombridge's (1748 – 1811), which exaggerates the house's distance from the river and seems bent on achieving a picturesque effect.[131]

Even among the works that aim for topographical accuracy, frustrating ambiguities exist. The earliest, Malcom's, of ca. 1792, predictably show less mature growth than the later views, revealing the serpentine path mentioned by visitors. However, two seldom-depicted buildings appear west of the house: a glasshouse and a pedimented structure whose lines mimic those of the mansion. What is the latter: a garden

---

[128] Timothy Long has taken an important step by superimposing Charles Drayton's 1806 sketch (see below) on Philip Price's ca. 1842 cemetery plan. Such efforts, combined with continued archeological investigation, are the most promising avenues for determining the layout of Hamilton's landscape.

[129] See footnote 48 and Fry, 67-74.

[130] Relevant works by these painters are discussed and reproduced in Foster, 76-77 (pl. 5), 266-69, 334, 352; Betts, 217-18, Martin P. Snyder, *City of Independence: Visions of Philadelphia before 1800* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1975), 168-176, colorplate 7; Avrahm Yarmolinsky, *Picturesque United States of America, 1811, 1812, 1813, Being a Memoir on Paul Svinin, Russian Diplomatic Officer, Artist and Author* (New York: William Edwin Rudge, 1930), x, pl. 33. Yarmolinsky misidentifies Svinin's painting as "General Moreau's country house at Morrisville, Pennsylvania" but Foster, 352 (n.40), corrects the error. On conventions governing the country-house genre, see Edward J. Nygren, "From View to Vision" in Nygren and Robertson, 21-25.

[131] On the other hand, Groombridge's pastoral may contain unique evidence of Hamilton's landscape. For instance, the contrast between the garden's smooth lawn and the unkempt meadow to the right is a detail lost in other frontal views. The painting, executed in 1793, is discussed in Betts, 217-119, Snyder, *City of Independence,* 176-177, and Nygren and Robertson, 262. In the mid twentieth century, art historian J. Hall Pleasants believed he had identified three other Groombridge paintings of The Woodlands; see Pleasants' "Studies in Maryland Painting," Maryland Historical Society, nos. 2434, 3819, 3820. All, however, depict Point Breeze, the estate of Joseph Bonaparte near Bordentown, New Jersey, as a comparison with Charles B. Lawrence's painting of that site (Nygren and Robertson, pl. 187) makes clear.

pavilion, the first greenhouse, or some generalized idea of the stable?[132] And why are both buildings absent in later depictions? Did Hamilton screen them out, or did later painters deem them an unnecessary complication?

Despite such discrepancies, Early National period views of the estate are in general agreement.[133] Between Mill Creek and his tenant farms to the north, Hamilton created a sophisticated landscape park that drew upon the principles of "Capability" Brown or on the large body of literature into which his ideas were absorbed. That corpus includes descriptions that apply to the site. As Timothy Long has noted, a passage marked in Hamilton's copy of Whately's *Observations* is a particularly close fit. Yet the urge to locate Hamilton's inspiration in a single text or example is probably misguided. Later country seats along the Schuylkill came out of this tradition, and Whately's broad language could apply as well to them.[134] Moreover, there was more to The Woodlands than could be discerned from afar.

Intimate portraits are scarce. Watson's unique view *from* the mansion catches some of the foreground but is better at showing the house's axial relationship to the floating bridge at Gray's Ferry and vistas on the Lower Schuylkill. Researchers seeking detailed information on the arrangement of the grounds must turn instead to correspondence and contemporary accounts. Hamilton's letters are a starting point. Filled with gardening orders and plant lists, they are at once rich in botanical detail and spare in the sorts of descriptions that tie species to particular locations. Visitors' notes have their own limitations. First, they focus heavily on the garden side of the site. Second, those of any depth appear to date from the nineteenth century. Nonetheless, study of these sources alongside the visual record yields a composite image that future archaeology promises to sharpen.

Early visitor observations often took the form of hasty judgments. Around 1797, for instance, a Polish nobleman noted, "[Hamilton's] farm contains 200 to 300 acres of very mediocre land as is all that environs of Philad…He leaves it fallow; he is interested only in his house, his hothouse and his Madeira."[135] This comment might be dismissed as an isolated jibe except that a French aristocrat made essentially the same complaint in the same period. According to the duc de La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt:

> [Hamilton's] house and gardens would receive as great embellishment from the neighborhood of a good tenantry, as he

---

[132] Fry advances the greenhouse theory (caption to Figure 4). A similar building, which Betts identifies as a greenhouse (p. 227), appears on Peter C. Varlé's 1796 *Plan of the City and its Environs,* reproduced in Snyder, *City of Independence*, colorplate 12.

[133] In addition to the watercolors discussed here, see two engravings by William Birch, another by William Strickland, and a watercolor by David J. Kennedy, all listed in the Bibliography.

[134] Foster's discussion (p. 46) of Eaglesfield as the design of a "second generation" Brownian is also relevant here. River views of The Woodlands and Eaglesfield reveal broad similarities.

[135] Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz, *Under Their Vine and Fig Tree: Travels through America in 1797-1799, 1805 with Some Further Account of Life in New Jersey,* trans. and ed. Metchie J. E. Budka (Elizabeth [NJ]: New Jersey Historical Society, 1965), 14: 52-53, as quoted in Fry, 11; see also Kornwolf, 100.

> would himself derive emolument from their labor; but either from indifference, or from a want of necessary funds to defray the expenses of clearing the land, it remains uncultivated, and his house seems surrounded by a desert.[136]

Snobbery surely colored these views. More importantly, they are contradicted by Thomas Twining's diary and by Peter Varlé's map of 1796 showing Hamilton's tenant farms under cultivation.[137] The discrepancy may be a symptom of cultural difference. Whereas an Englishman like William Groombridge admired and accentuated the site's picturesque qualities, Continentals tended to see the same characteristics as signs of neglect. A related complaint was that Hamilton focused on his botanical collections at the expense of the garden as a whole. As scholars have recently noted, the heyday of the English landscape movement coincided with a heightened interest in the scientific study and rearing of plants. Yet the perceived conflict between collection and composition spawned theoretical debates in Hamilton's day and has ensnared historians thereafter.[138] In 1917, for instance, Fiske Kimball claimed that "As a result of [Hamilton's] botanical interests, …his grounds took on rather the character of a museum-garden than of a composition of natural landscape."[139]

It was Americans who saw novelty in The Woodlands and they who recorded it most carefully. A well-known letter from "L.G." to "Eliza," probably written in 1800,[140] and the 1806 diary of Charles Drayton[141] are by far the richest sources. Their significance lies partly in their complementary nature. L.G., apparently a young woman, was minutely aware of sensory impressions and catalogued them in Romantic prose. Drayton, by contrast, stressed materials, measurements, and techniques; where she praised visual effects, he picked out features Hamilton wished to conceal. In the end, neither visitor strayed far from the prescribed route. (Where,

---

[136] François-Alexandre-Frederic, duc de La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, *Travels Through the United States of North America...in the Years 1795, 1796 and 1797* (London 1800), 3: 482-83, as quoted in Fry, 11-12.
[137] Thomas Twining, *Travels in America 100 Years Ago* [1795] (New York: Harper & Bros., 1894), 163; *Plan of the City and its Environs*.
[138] Laird, *Flowering*, 16, 260-262.
[139] Fiske Kimball, "The Beginnings of Landscape Gardening in America," *Landscape Architecture* 7, no. 4 (July 1917): 184.
[140] The document, located in HSP's Society Collection, is marked "Sunday June 15," and attempts to date it have focused on the years in which these terms coincided (see Betts, 217, n. 8; Long, "Woodlands," 369, n. 139; Jacobs 37-38, n. 154). Another clue is L.G.'s assertion that, from the grotto, "you might have a view of the mill back of Gray's, but as the owner will not be induced to part with it although he has been offered £100 per acre for 50 acres Mr. Hamilton has entirely shut it out." If L.G. means *five* acres, as seems likely given the parcel in question, Hamilton's offer comes to £500, the amount stated in his "Terms of purchase offer for Schuylkill Mill," presented via John Child in June of 1797 (General Thomas Cadwalader Papers, Cadwalader Coll., Series 3, Box 108, HSP). The purchase offer would then supply a *terminus post quem* for the letter. A *terminus ante quem* appears in "Mr. [Thomas] Lloyd's survey of the Strip of Land leased by David Jones to W[illiam] H[amilton]" of April 1803 (same collection and box). Combining these parameters with occurrences of Sunday June 15th yields 1800 as the date of the letter. In any case, the document cannot predate 1794, the first year when June 15th fell on Sunday after Hamilton's negotiation with Jones commenced (Long, "Woodlands," 154-155, 430, n. 396).
[141] Dr. Charles Drayton Diary (photocopied transcription), 2 November 1806, Drayton Hall, National Trust for Historic Preservation.

for instance, are the outbuildings mentioned in a 1798 tax assessment?) Nonetheless, their two accounts may serve to introduce key components of the landscape.[142]

The Park

The approach to Hamilton's mansion was a study in contrasts, embracing and releasing visitors before depositing them at the head of an artfully enclosed lawn. L.G. recounted: "you wind round a small declivity through a clear wood consisting almost entirely of young trees & through the opening valley you have a distant view of the city." This terrain lay in the area Hamilton had cultivated as a "small park" since his 1779 letter to William Tilghman. Measuring roughly 100 acres, it stretched north and east of the house, losing some seclusion when Darby Road (now Woodland Avenue) was extended from Mill Creek to the West Chester Road in the early 1780s.[143] L.G.'s observation regarding the age of the trees is significant. During the Revolution, Hamilton had undertaken a clear-cutting campaign that brought his grounds within view of Philadelphia. Tried for treason in the city, he regretted the new visual relationship almost immediately. He asked Tilghman, "Do you remember how anxious I was two or three years ago to have a peep at the Town, thro the Center Wood? 'Twas then an object of my Regard, but at present I so cordially hate it, that altho the prospect of it lately open'd by the total removal of the Wood is a most commanding one, & would at any other time have been admired, It is now absolutely disgusting to me."[144] A replanting effort must have ensued, leaving the city still partially in view.

Other evidence of the park's form and evolution is fragmentary. Drayton mentions the "lawn & clumps" fronting the mansion and his accompanying sketch constitutes the only known landscape plan from the Hamilton era. Later maps show the entrance road crossing tributaries to Middle Run, a stream that passed east of the house.[145] The valley carved out by this watercourse was a rich source of plant materials and Hamilton used it as a sort of informal nursery. In 1785, for instance, he ordered "as many of the sassafras, & of the broad leaved laurel and also of the dwarf laurel from the valley" shipped to his uncle's creditors in London."[146]

---

[142] Landscape garden nomenclature is a topic unto itself. Although English and American terms are not entirely interchangeable, the definitions supplied in Laird, *Flowering*, 9-13, guide the following discussion. On the 1798 tax and the outbuildings it mentions, see Fry, 116, 121-123.

[143] Joseph Jackson, *Encyclopedia of Philadelphia* (Harrisburg: National Historical Association, 1931), 1:542. This new section of Darby Road was known as Woodland Street until 1857, when the entire route was renamed Woodland Avenue. West Chester Road was the former name of Market Street.

[144] WH to Tilghman, [no day] April 1779, Society Coll., HSP.

[145] *Map of the County Nine Miles West of the City of Philadelphia and between Darby Creek & Young's Ford on the River Schuylkill, Surveyed by Order of Gen'l Jonathan Williams, Chairman of the Subcommittee of Defense, Philadelphia, 28 September 1814, Topographical Engineers: William Strickland, Robt. Brooke, and Wm. Kneass,* American Philosophical Society Collection; *Plan of the City of Philadelphia and Adjoining Districts Originally Drawn by W. Allen Enlarged with numerous additions and corrections by F. J. Roberts,* 1838, photostat at Free Library of Philadelphia.

[146] WH to BHS, 2 November 1785. On removal of plant materials from the valley, see also WH to BHS, 30 September 1785.

The Garden or Pleasure Ground

By 1806, The Woodlands' celebrated garden had evolved in numerous small ways from the scheme Hamilton had implemented two decades earlier. However, the general layout remained essentially unchanged. Charles Drayton summarized:

> The Garden consists of a large verdant lawn surrounded by a belt of walk, & shrubbery for some distance. the outer side of the walk is adorned here & there, by scattered forest trees, thick and thin. It is bounded, partly as described – partly by the Schuylkill & a creek exhibiting a Mill. & where it is scarcely noticed, by a common post & rail. The walk is said to be a mile long – perhaps it is something less. One is led into the garden form the portico, to the east or lefthand, or from the park, by a small gate contiguous to the house. traversing this walk, one sees many beauties of landscape – also a fine Statue, symbol of Winter, & age. - & a Spacious Conservatory about 20 yards to the West of the Mansion.

Here is the anatomy of the visitor's circuit: its length, principal features and the order in which Hamilton intended them to be seen. Other accounts confirm his success in reproducing this quintessential fixture of the English landscape garden.[147] It was L.G., however, who studied the route's periphery most astutely:

> [Hamilton] took us round his walks which are planted on each side with the most beautiful & curious flowers & shrubs[.] they are in some parts enclosed with the Lombardy poplar except here and there openings are left to give you a view of some fine trees or beautiful prospect beyond, & in others, shaded by arbors of the wild grape, or clumps of large trees under which are placed seats where you may rest yourself & enjoy the cool air—when you arrive at the bottom of the lawn along the borders of the river you find quite a natural walk which takes the form of the grounds entirely shaded with trees & the greatest profusion of grapes which perfumes the air in a most delightful manner, its fragrance resembles that of the Minionet, a little further on, you come to a charming spring, some part of the ground is hollowed out where Mr. Hamilton is going to form a grotto, he has already collected some shells; from this place you might have a view of the mill back of Gray's, but as the owner will not be induced to part with it although he has been offered L100 per acre for 50 acres Mr. Hamilton has entirely shut it out-the walk terminates at the Green-house which is very large…

---

[147] All surviving accounts of the circuit indicate that Hamilton intended it to be experienced in this sequence, that is, clockwise. See also Oldschool, 506-507; Westcott, 424 (probably based on Oldschool). On circuits and the importance of sequence, see Quest-Ritson 141, 149; Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House: A Social and Architectural History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978), 210-211.

The description conveys the sensory richness of the pleasure ground, notably the attention given to scent. (Unlike Drayton, L.G. had the advantage of visiting in summertime). Furthermore, assuming continuity of design, L.G. clarifies what Drayton means by "shrubbery" along the walk. This consists of deciduous trees interspersed with shrubs and flowers. It is a heterogeneous arrangement familiar from its use on the other side of the Atlantic, notably at Woburn Farm and Woodside.[148]

At a basic stylistic level, both accounts cast doubt on such broad classifications as "Brownian" or "Reptonian." The shell-covered grotto spotted by L.G. is a case in point. An oasis with classical precedent, this feature resurfaced famously at Alexander Pope's Twickenham, which may also have influenced later Schuylkill River estates.[149] Drayton calls attention to "a fine Statue, symbol of Winter, & age," and he is not alone. Other nineteenth-century commentators noted that "Statues, busts and urns were placed about," some commemorating those "who gave practical examples of their taste in gardening, or stimulated it by their poetry."[150] If the general effect was "expressive" rather than allusive, literary references were still replete. Moreover, there were parts of The Woodlands that might fall out of the English canon entirely. Late in the nineteenth century, an elderly annalist recalled peering through "a square or oval opening of leaves, that seemed a picture frame, so nicely were the boughs trimmed with the view to secure the charming vistas afforded by the Schuylkill."[151] The description conceivably points to a staple of seventeenth-century French gardening, the *palissade*.

A subset of the larger debate over classification involves how much heed Hamilton paid to the ideal of the *ferme ornée*. Here, final judgment must await further study. When Stephen Switzer advocated a 'farm-like way of gardening' in the first half of the eighteenth century, he meant "a literal mixing of the pleasurable and profitable parts of country life."[152] By 1770, Thomas Whately was inclined to see these elements as incongruous, yet Americans such as Thomas Jefferson were not discouraged, and explicitly sought the effect Switzer described.[153] William Hamilton's case is more ambiguous. On one hand, he erected a monument to William Shenstone, the creator of England's paradigmatic ornamental farm; perhaps

---

[148] Laird, *Flowering*, xvi, 104-105, 187. On Syon House, where Capability Brown used evergreens in a similar scheme, see pp. 142, 144.
[149] Hunt, 91-94; O'Malley, 144-145. The other documented grotto on the Schuylkill was Henry Pratt's, whose garden at Lemon Hill may have benefited from Hamilton's example or from the experience of his gardener, John McArran; see Joseph and Nesta Ewan, "John Lyon," 7, n.12, and Joseph Ewan, "Philadelphia Heritage," 10-11. While Twickenham's grotto was early and influential, others appeared in such canonical landscape gardens as Painshill, Stourhead and Nuneham Courtenay; see Ross Watson, catalogue entry no. 362 in Adams, 210.
[150] Joshua Francis Fisher, *Recollections of Joshua Francis Fisher, Written in 1864*, ed. Sophia Cadwalader (Boston: Merrymount Press, 1929), 219.
[151] Ward, 164.
[152] William A. Brogden, "The Ferme Ornée and Changing Attitudes to Agricultural Improvement" in Maccubbin and Martin, 40.
[153] O'Malley, 136-137; Hunt and Willis, 333; Laird, *Flowering*, 104-105.

the homage went further, influencing the composition of shrubberies and borders.[154] On the other hand, neither L.G. nor Drayton mentions seeing agricultural features on their tours.[155] The omission indicates a "literal mixing" was not what Hamilton had in mind. If he wished to reproduce a particular aesthetic, it was the picturesque eclecticism of a Nunemham Coutenay, with its belts and clumps, busts of poets, and conservatory overlooking a flower garden.[156]

The Conservatory and Exotics Beds

Contemporary accounts all point to the conservatory as the pleasure ground's highlight – a botanical cathedral concluding a horticultural pilgrimage. This showplace stood northwest of the mansion and came together gradually. Hamilton mentions a greenhouse as early as 1785 (many of the plants he sent back from England ended up there).[157] Three years later he was instructing his steward on using the "Back flue of the Hot-House," but it was not until 1792 that work commenced on the larger complex known to nineteenth-century visitors.[158] Whether this structure was all-new or grafted onto the earlier buildings remains unclear. In any case, the result drew public notice and had already influenced the design of a greenhouse in New York's Elgin Gardens by the time of Drayton's visit.[159]

No illustrations of Hamilton's scheme have come to light. However, an 1840s plan shows the mansion and conservatory aligned in parallel while the more distant stable confronts them at an oblique angle.[160] The arrangement was a studied one. Hamilton had erected the stable shortly before rebuilding the conservatory and he treated the structures as "separate incidents in the landscape."[161] It was a nod toward the fashionable informality that governed site planning in contemporary English gardens.

---

[154] Joshua Francis Fisher, *Recollections*, 219; Laura, "The Woodlands," *Port Folio* n.s. 1, no. 2 (February 1809): 181; Long, "Woodlands," 20-23, 35, 110. Walk-side shrubberies like Woburn Farm's are the clearest link between The Woodlands and the *ferme ornée* aesthetic. Hamilton also mentions using vegetables in ornamental borders, as in "The long row of cucumbers along the Locust border," WH, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, to BHS, [The Woodlands], n.d. June 1790, as quoted in Long, "Woodlands," 136.

[155] Drayton specifically notes: "The kitchen garden & Hort. yard [and] Orchard, which I did not see, are, I suppose behind the stables, & adjacent."

[156] Similarities between The Woodlands and Nuneham went beyond the general effect. While hypotheses based purely on visual evidence are always a risky enterprise, it is tempting to see a line of influence between the Oxfordshire estate and Hamilton's. Both had: a tree-studded lawn descending to a river; a U-shaped 'back' lawn flanked by shrubberies and partially enclosed by clumps opposite the house; a conservatory zone that included round flower beds and a grotto. See Laird, *Flowering*, 321 (fig. 191), 351.

[157] WH to BHS, 21 February 1785, as quoted in Long, "Woodlands," 96; WH to BHS, 2 November 1785.

[158] WH to BHS, 16 February 1788 (quotation); WH to BHS, 3 August 1792, in Long, "Woodlands," 143.

[159] Long, "Woodlands," 144. Oldschool's published description of Hamilton's conservatory (p. 507) is useful both for listing species kept in the building and for confirming Drayton's dimensions (the length of the complex is given as 140 feet). See also "Visit of Manasseh Cutler," 110, and Sarah P. Stetson, "William Hamilton and His Woodlands," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 73, no. 1 (January 1949): 28-31, on the structure's significance and Cutler's visit.

[160] See footnote 48.

[161] The phrase is from Girouard, 211. On the stable, erected between 1789 and 1792, see Long, "Woodlands," 143.

What struck Drayton was the conservatory's interior layout. He noted:

> The Conservatory consists of a green house, & 2 hot houses – one being at each end of it. The green house may be about 50 feet long. The front only is glazed. Scaffolds are erected one higher than another, on which plants in pots or tubs are planted so that it resembles a declivity of a mountain…On the floor a walk of 5 or six feet extends along the glazed wall. & at each end a door opens into a Hot House – so that a long walk extends in one line along the Stove walls of the houses & the glazed wall of the green house.
>
> The Hot houses. They may extend in front, I suppose, 40 feet each. They have a wall heated by flues - & 3 glazed walls & a glazed roof each. In the center, a frame of wood is raised about 2 1/2 feet high, & occupying the whole area except leaving a passage by the walls. In the flue wall, or adjoining, is a cistern for exotic plants. Within the frame, is composed a hot bed; into which the pots & tubs [are] plunged. This conservatory is said to be equal to any in Europe. It contains between 7 & 8000 plants.

The reference to a staggered scaffold that "resembles a declivity of a mountain" is especially intriguing because the technique carried over to the landscape. During the summer months, Hamilton transferred hardier exotics from the conservatory to four nearby beds. Of these, Drayton wrote:

> There are 2. large oval grass plats in front of the Conservatory - & 2 behind. Holes are nicely made in these, to receive the pots & tubs with their plants, even to their rims. The tallest are placed in the centre, & decreasing to the verge. thus they represent a miniature hill clothed with choice vegetations.

Like the scaffold, then, the exotics beds formed an orderly slope that impressed visitors as a sort of microcosm or conspectus. Garden historian Mark Laird has recently explored this idea's long and complex history. Manifested in the auricula "stage" and related forms of botanical display, the concept drew an analogy to theater design and guided the layout of shrubberies and flower gardens throughout the eighteenth century.[162] One book that popularized such arrangements was Philip Miller's *Gardeners Dictionary*, first published in 1731. Hamilton knew the work but need not have consulted it while arranging his specimens; the "'theatrical' manner of planting" appeared even in nursery catalogues after 1750.[163] Circular and oval beds had a separate but related past. They converged with graduated planting schemes in

---

[162] Laird, *Flowering*, xiv, 16, chap. 1 (*passim*), 133, 191, 204-211, 246-249.

[163] Ibid., 133. That Hamilton had been using Miller's book before his trip to England is apparent in WH to BHS, 8 October 1784. That he was adhering to the principle of graduated display in the same decade is clear from his instruction that "all the exotics should be arranged according to their sizes in the way I directed particularly the pots on the shelves," WH to BHS, 2 May 1789.

Nathaniel Swinden's *The Beauties of Flora Display'd* (1778), the language of which evokes images similar to Drayton's.[164] Significantly, such beds also stood out in published views of Nuneham Courtenay and Wrotham.[165] Both estates may have influenced The Woodlands in other respects.

Exotics were mobile features of the landscape garden. Servants moved them seasonally from the conservatory to outdoor beds and, over longer periods, from one outdoor location to another. In the late 1780s, a workspace called the "Exotic yard" lay near the greenhouse.[166] By June of 1790, Hamilton had shifted the contents of this zone "to the north front of the House by way of experiment."[167] What Drayton saw, then, was yet another solution, apparently contrived since L.G.'s visit.[168]

Flowers were a staple of the exotics beds but hardly confined to them. L.G. noticed "beautiful & curious flowers & shrubs" along the circuit walk and Hamilton referred to a "white flowering Bean, some convolvus, Ipomoea, nasturtium and different gourds" intended for "a small 3 feet wide Border in front of the necessary [privy] skreen of cedars & Lombardy poplars."[169] Borders filled with "Polianthos snow drops" flanked the walk to the ice house.[170] And an ornamental zone near the mansion featured "magnolias & other terrace shrubs."[171]

The Kitchen Garden and Its Environs

While visitors remembered the conservatory primarily as a botanical museum, there were more practical reasons for maintaining glasshouses at The Woodlands. These structures sheltered not only exotics but also plants destined for the kitchen garden, an expansive, five-sided plot located somewhere north of the stable. On the scale of public accessibility, the kitchen garden ranked below the exotics beds or anything else on the visitors' circuit. Nevertheless, Hamilton clearly intended the area to be seen by outsiders and was annoyed when they reported signs of neglect there.[172]

A plan of the kitchen garden survives, showing a neat polygon traversed by tree-lined walks and served by a well.[173] Crops there included herbs such as dill and fennel,

---

[164] Laird, *Flowering*, 331. On prior use of circular and oval beds, see pp. 184-85, 194, 200-202.
[165] Ibid., 331-333, 351.
[166] WH to BHS, 2 May 1789.
[167] WH to BHS, 12 June 1790.
[168] L.G. noted that "the plants are all removed to a place back of the Green-house where they are ranged in the most beautiful order" – evidently a return to the pre-1790 location.
[169] WH to BHS, 16 February 1788.
[170] WH to BHS, 2 May 1789.
[171] WH to BHS, [?] June 1790. There was at least one flowering border near the mansion; see WH to BHS, 6 February 1789, as transcribed in Long, "Woodlands," 397, n. 155. In addition, Drayton's sketch shows two circles with dots in their centers flanking the north front of the house. While these marks may indicate trees alone, they are as likely to document flower beds with specimen trees, a feature appearing in several prominent English gardens; see Laird, *Flowering*, 184-58, 193-194.
[172] WH to BHS, 21 [July] 1788, quoted in Long, "Woodlands," 134.
[173] Kitchen Garden diagram, [June 1790], General Thomas Cadwalader Papers, Cadwalader Coll., HSP, as discussed in Long, "Woodlands," 130.

several varieties of beans, cauliflower, pumpkins, potatoes, and large quantities of cabbage.[174] A student of scientific farming, Hamilton prided himself on knowing precisely when particular vegetables should be planted. As was so often the case, this expertise translated into stern exhortations to servants when the master was away.[175]

Drayton noted: "The kitchen garden & Hort. yard [and] Orchard, which I did not see, are, I suppose behind the Stables, & adjacent." The comment points to a broad zone of cultivation that encompassed far more than kitchen garden. Information on the other components is virtually nonexistent. The "Hort. yard" could conceivably have been the nursery Hamilton established while abroad. All three areas lay near a road that ran northwest of the picturesque entrance drive and may have predated it.[176]

The Landscape of Domestic Service

If Hamilton considered certain utilitarian spaces marginally suitable for display, there were others he was determined to screen from view. Most notable among them was a sunken service corridor connecting the mansion to the principal outdoor work area near the stable. Beneath the main rooms of the house, in what Britons knew as a "rustic," were the spaces where Hamilton's servants worked, dined, and awaited his summons. While this zone communicated with upper stories through a spiral staircase, it also extended into the landscape by means of a cryptoporticus and a semi-subterranean path. Charles Drayton was intrigued by these features. He wrote:

> From the cellar one enters under the bow window & into this Screen which is about 6 or 7 feet Square [T]hrough these, we enter a narrow area, & ascend some few Steps into the garden - & thro the other opening we ascend a paved winding slope, which spreads as it ascends, into the yard. This sloping passage being a segment of a circle, & its outer walls concealed by [a] Screen of masonry, keeps the yard, & I believe the whole passage out of sight from the house – but certainly from the garden and park-lawn.

In this way, Hamilton wove house and grounds together while segregating the served and serving populations. The ascending pathway wound along the border between the park and the garden, eventually fanning out into the stable yard. And while the fence separating park and garden east of the house consisted merely of "posts and lathes," it thickened into "posts, rails & boards" to the west where the sunken passage ran. Hidden behind this wooden wall, itself concealed by evergreen hedges, servants moved invisibly, even inaudibly, to outbuildings, the kitchen garden and the orchard.

---

[174] WH to BHS, 2 May 1789; WH to BHS, 1 June 1789; WH to BHS, 28 May 1790; WH to BHS, 12 June 1790; all as discussed in Long, "Woodlands," 131-132.
[175] See WH to BHS, 27 September 1789, and 12 June 1790, as quoted in Long, "Woodlands," 132.
[176] The road appears on *Plan of the City of Philadelphia and Adjoining Districts*. Aligned at a right angle with the stable, it may be the former entrance road mentioned in WH to BHS, [3?] October 1789.

The scheme struck Americans as strange and ingenious: Drayton's meticulous notes convey his sense of revelation. At the same time, the design reflected emerging ideas about nature and individualism that were hardly confined to The Woodlands. Architectural historian Mark Girouard has discussed the impact of this new sensibility on the English country house, noting the gradual "sinking" force it exerted on servants' spaces.[177] Hidden paths were a related symptom, better known in the New World though the example of Jefferson's Monticello.[178] Both at home and abroad, the trend toward Romanticism fostered an image of unmediated communion with nature that necessarily obscured the human systems on which 'country life' depended.

Views, or the Sum of the Parts

Useful as it is to examine individual elements of The Woodlands' landscape, the exercise neglects the ways in which the pieces worked in concert – with each other, with the house, and with the geography of greater Philadelphia. *Views* were what tied the fabric together. L.G.'s glimpse of the city from the entrance drive suggests an artful disclosure of distant prospects. Other sources reveal Hamilton as a skilled appropriator of his surroundings, prepared not only to frame views but also to alter their contents. As early as 1785, he made plans to adorn a public bridge over Mill Creek with ivy in order to enhance its picturesque appeal.[179] Several years later, he began pressing the owner of a creek-side mill to sell the parcel on which the building stood, perhaps as part of grand development scheme.[180] Unable to obtain the property, he had "entirely shut it out" by the time of L.G.'s visit, thus resorting to a tried-and-true park-maker's tactic.[181] Still, there were aspects of the viewshed that outstretched Hamilton's control. Visitors who arrived when the Schuylkill was at low ebb were liable to see mudflats – an unwelcome intrusion on the sensory environment for which the master strove.[182]

Closer to the house, Hamilton used ha-has to protect his flowers from cattle and to project the illusion of boundless lawns.[183] This technique, too, betrayed a familiarity with the park-maker's repertoire that few American contemporaries had the knowledge or means to deploy. But the game of uniting architecture and landscape was Hamilton's true forte. Spending time and money on obtaining distant views, he multiplied that investment many times over through a series of optical illusions staged from indoors. L.G. described the result:

---

[177] Girouard, 218-219.
[178] Dell Upton, *Architecture in the United States* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 30-31. Laird, *Flowering* (p.56) briefly discusses English use of the shrubbery "to screen outbuildings or act as a hidden walk for the gardeners and servants to pass unseen from one place to another." He cites the grounds of Chiswick House as an example (n. 56, pp. 390-391), and it is an intriguing one given that site's connection to Monticello.
[179] WH to BHS, 30 September 1785.
[180] Long, "Woodlands," 154-155.
[181] Quest-Ritson, 142.
[182] Niemcewicz, 53, as quoted in Fry, 11. See also Madsen, 19.
[183] WH to BHS, 30 September 1785; WH to BHS, 22 October 1790; both as discussed in Long, "Woodlands," 140.

> [A]s you enter the hall [i.e. the saloon] you have a view of a remarkably fine lawn, beyond that, the bridge over which people are constantly passing, the rocky ground opposite to Gray's, four or five windings of the Schuylkill, the intermediate county & the Delaware terminated by the blue mist of the Jersey shore -- on one side you see distinctly the City & the surrounding country, on the opposite end, another view of the Schuylkill & the green-house-at the back the eye is refreshed with the sight of the most beautiful trees. The whole of this is heightened by mirror doors which when closed repeats the landscape & has a very fine effect…. [A]nother effect produced from them is that when you are at one end of the house & look through them, you, not only see the whole length but that, being reflected by these glass doors gives you an idea of its being twice the extent.

Since the mid eighteenth century, English landscape theorists had argued that "the Gardener and Builder ought to go Hand in Hand."[184] The extent to which Hamilton explored this idea may well have been unprecedented in the New World.[185] It guided his approach to site planning, as the disposition of the stable and conservatory showed; it underlay his subtle erasure of domestic labor from the visible plane; and it turned the house's formal rooms into a sort of pastoral hall of mirrors, neither outside nor inside but somewhere in between. None of these conceits was wholly new to the practice of landscape gardening. Their significance lay rather in their relationship and degree of development in an American context.

[184] Stephen Switzer, *Iconographica Rustica* (London 1742), 2: 154, as quoted in Hunt and Willis, 26.
[185] Long, "Woodlands," 25-28, 44, 56-64, 79-81, 107, 110, 140-141; Betts, 219, 221; Madsen, 17.

2. Subsequent Plans and Construction: Woodlands Cemetery

Development Phase I: 1839-1845

The Woodlands Cemetery Company effected a thoroughgoing transformation of William Hamilton's estate in the mid nineteenth century. The changes occurred over several decades and their gradual nature along with a much-touted managerial preservation ethic have tended to belie their extent. Two engines drove the process: a complex cultural phenomenon known as the rural cemetery movement and financial investments in a speculative real estate venture. Since these interwoven forces are the subjects of a subsequent section, they will receive only passing mention here.

On William Hamilton's death, his heirs inherited roughly 385 acres – a mix of farmland and building lots, some of which had been developed as part of a trading village west of Philadelphia. The Woodlands proper was understood to encompass about 91 acres "annexed to the Mansion house."[186] Here, Hamilton's nephew James and niece Margaret tried to maintain their uncle's lavish creation with less money and fewer servants. Describing Margaret as "the principal directress of the Woodlands," an 1815 visitor noted: "[she] keeps several men constantly at work, and is making great improvements."[187] The precise nature of this project is unclear; it may have related to an irrigation system that James was building in the same period. Likely designed to compensate for a dwindling workforce, this elaborate network of wooden pipes watered the garden by connecting it to outlying springs.[188] Other changes were afoot, too. Although the conservatory still housed many of William Hamilton's prized plants, visitors now broke with his protocol by *starting* their tours there.[189]

The War of 1812 left traces in the surrounding landscape. Most notable was Fort Hamilton, erected in 1814 and standing just east of the estate's entrance, in alignment with a federal arsenal on the other side of the Schuylkill River.[190] Of greater long-term consequence was the war's effect on the local economy. The ensuing depression slowed the City's growth for several years, reducing development pressures along the Schuylkill that might otherwise have claimed The Woodlands. Starting in the 1820s, however, the region's anthracite coal business gained momentum, filling the river with coal boats and increasing demand for wharf space.[191] It was with an eye to this market that Thomas Mitchell purchased The Woodlands in 1831.

---

[186] Haines, "Survey of part of the Woodlands Estate."
[187] [Margaret G. Cary], "The 'Woodlands' Described in 1815," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 15 (1891): 496.
[188] "From the Memoirs of the Philadelphia Society for Promoting Agriculture," *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser*, 1 June 1815, as quoted in Long, "Woodlands," 173.
[189] 25 November 1814 entry, *The Diary of Harriet Manigault, 1813-1816* (Rockland, ME: Printed for the Colonial Dames of America by Maine Coast Printers, [1976]), 61. Discerning visitors felt Hamilton's garden was in rapid decline as early as 1810; see Henry Muhlenberg to Stephen Elliott, 17 December 1810, quoted in Joseph and Nesta Ewan, "John Lyon," 8; Joseph Ewan, "Frederick Pursh," 605.
[190] *Map of the County Nine Miles West of the City of Philadelphia*; Long, "Woodlands," 172.
[191] Edgar P. Richardson, "The Athens of America, 1800-1825" and Nicholas B. Wainwright "The Age of Nicholas Biddle, 1825-1841" in Russell F. Weigley, ed., *Philadelphia: A 300-Year History* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1982), 239, 266-269.

Over the next eight years, Mitchell struggled to realize his grand plan for a canal and wharves along the Schuylkill's western bank. Meanwhile, industry encroached from several directions at once. To the west, a cluster of mills established by Jacob Mayland and members of the Jones family continued to spread along Mill Creek, itself dammed and channeled to a new extent.[192] To the south, Mitchell began renting wharves to the Delaware Coal Company in anticipation of his larger scheme's success. Land access to these rectangular inlets came from Lehman Street, driven across The Woodlands' waterfront in 1838.[193] Thus, although Mitchell's canal scheme eventually foundered, it had a lasting impact on local topography and on the ways Woodlands Cemetery's backers would think about their institution's relationship to the river.

Forces other than industry were also at work in the area. As Philadelphia grew, an array of institutions sprang up on its periphery, testing theories of reform that required a remote or "rural" setting. Among these was the Blockley Alms House, erected east of The Woodlands in the early 1830s.[194] Another such venture was the Woodlands Cemetery itself. Incorporated in 1840, it built on the local precedent of Laurel Hill Cemetery and, as a land speculation, picked up where the canal plan left off.

The Woodlands Cemetery Company was unable to purchase the estate for which it was named until June of 1843. By that time, cemetery development had been underway for almost four years, albeit sporadically. Thomas Mitchell took the first steps in 1839, partnering with two other businessmen and engaging Philip M. Price to conduct preliminary surveys.[195] As this work proceeded, the need for basic infrastructure must have been pressing. The services of mason John Keech were part of the solution. By the close of 1840, he had built a receiving vault for the temporary storage of corpses and had probably commenced repairs on a bridge over Middle Run.[196] Enclosures were another early focus. In September, 1840, the newly designated cemetery managers agreed to meet with their counterparts at the Almshouse for the purpose of erecting a fence between the two institutions.[197] Whatever the outcome of this encounter, it left most of the site open – a conundrum for a company with limited resources.

---

[192] *Plan of the City of Philadelphia and Adjoining Districts*; Leon S. Rosenthal, *A History of Philadelphia's University City* (Philadelphia: West Philadelphia Corporation, 1963), 71.
[193] Elihu D. Tarr to Woodlands Cemetery Board of Managers, 10 November 1843, WCCC. Mitchell may have intended Lehman Street as the first segment of his canal's towpath, as F. J. Roberts' 1838 *Plan of the City of Philadelphia and Adjoining Districts* suggests.
[194] Richard Webster, *Philadelphia Preserved: Catalog of the Historic American Buildings Survey*, 2d ed. (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1981), 196. On the place of rural cemeteries in the larger "specialization" of urban fabric, see Kenneth L. Ames, "Ideologies in Stone: Meanings in Victorian Gravestones," *Journal of Popular Culture* 14, no. 4 (Spring 1981): 642, 651.
[195] "The Cemeteries of Philadelphia. – Woodlands Cemetery," *Philadelphia Public Ledger*, 26 July 1871; PMP, Report to Woodlands Cemetery Managers, 30 December 1843, WCCC.
[196] See fn. 54.
[197] Managers Minutes, 1 September 1840.

It was in this context that manager Eli K. Price first displayed an interest in cemetery-related landscape design. Writing to West Chester botanist and banker David Townsend, Price explained:

> We have been thinking of iron and stone fences for the Woodlands Cemetery; but when we consider the expense with the probable slow sales for a length of time are somewhat discouraged by the cost; and again they would be very easily scaled by ladders, tho' 7 or 8 feet high. It has occurred to me that hedging of thorns would be both cheaper and more secure, and I should be glad to know whether I am right in this impression. If so, I should like to know what kind of thorn is best for the purpose.[198]

The letter reveals Price as a fledgling horticulturist. He writes with confidence about "the Virginia thorn" and is uniquely qualified to do so: three decades earlier, his father had been "deputed by his neighbors" to find the plant in its native state and bring it north to Chester County; as an adult, Eli prided himself on being "present at the division of the seeds, and help[ing] to plant the first hedges."[199] But his knowledge is essentially local. He suspects a hardier hedge is grown by the county's polymath botanist, William Darlington, but turns to David Townsend for advice on suppliers, prices, and alternative species. There are also clues about cemetery managers' priorities. Price concluded: "We have a locust on the ground armed with large thorns that we think of trying, but have to begin with the seeds, and wish the road fronts sooner secured than can be from them."

What explains this urge to fortify? Despite the encroachments of industry, The Woodlands stood over a mile from the city proper, suggesting that body-snatching or proximity to the almshouse were the principal causes for concern. Few rural cemeteries of the period placed such emphasis on practical security measures. More typical was the sort of symbolic impregnability seen locally at Laurel Hill, where looming bastions terminated the front wall. Architect Thomas Ustick Walter may have influenced that design and it was to him that Thomas Mitchell turned in the fall of 1842.[200] On November 15th, Mitchell paid Walter twenty dollars for a "design for altering the front of Woodlands Cemetery." This project probably called for some reworking of Hamilton's Federal-style entrance lodges. In any case, it remained on hold while the company confronted fiscal and managerial difficulties.

---

[198] EKP to David Townsend, 15 November 1840, document L16345, Letter Coll., CCHS. On Townsend, see Harshberger, *Botanists of Philadelphia*, 163-164.

[199] Futhey and Cope, 691, 699.

[200] Walter's diary, 11 – 21 May 1836, confirms that he devised a plan and elevation for Laurel Hill. The Library Company of Philadelphia owns a large, unsigned drawing that includes a crude pen-and-ink plan and a pencil sketch of a crenellated Gothic front wall. Both schemes are derived from Henry E. Kendall's pamphlet, *Sketches of the Approved Designs of a Chapel and Gateway Entrances intended to be erected at Kensal Green for the General Cemetery Company* (1832). In his 1973 University of Delaware master's thesis "The Landscape Gardening of John Notman, 1810-1865" (p. 22), Keith Morgan attributed the Library Company drawing to Walter. The attribution is questionable but the bastions were built and Walter may have had a hand in them. On his work at Woodlands Cemetery, see footnote 41.

Before William Hamilton's grounds could serve their new purpose, the Woodlands Cemetery Company faced two major obstacles. First, it had to gain title to the land, bound up since Mitchell's purchase in a sizeable mortgage. Second, the managers needed a detailed plan showing roads, paths, and burial plots. Steps toward the latter goal actually predated the company's formation. Sometime in 1839, Eli Price's brother Philip surveyed the boundaries of the property at Mitchell's behest. This campaign merged seamlessly with projects Philip subsequently undertook in his official capacity as company surveyor. He later recalled:

> The work was commenced in 1839, and occupied the greater part of 1840, with two assistants. During this period all the carriage roads or drives were carefully laid out with the theodolite…. These drives were marked by yellow pine stakes set in at distances of twenty feet apart, occasionally connected with trees, buildings or other permanent objects to secure accuracy in the results.[201]

Philip Price and his collaborators appear to have prepared their original plan for the cemetery in the winter of 1841 – 1842.[202] Although the drawing has vanished, later lithographs convey a clear sense of the scheme.[203] Serpentine avenues, generally named for trees, traversed the ground between Woodlands and Lehman Streets, providing access even to the steep terrain around Middle Run. Hamilton's entrance road survived as Mansion Avenue. It led to a string of circular drives, axially aligned and broadening as they neared the river: Hamilton Avenue (the original carriage turnaround), Mansion Circle (which ringed the house), and South Circle Avenue. The former "ice house hill" became the cemetery's central node, defined by Centre Circle Avenue. Here Price located some of the first burial lots, ranging them around circular and arcuate paths in a twisting quincunx pattern. To the north, the old

---

[201] PMP, report to Woodlands Cemetery Managers, 30 December 1843, WCCC.

[202] Ibid. In this document, Price mentions that surveying stalled in 1841, then adds: "During the succeeding winter the accompanying draft or plan was prepared from our notes, and may be relied upon as strictly accurate in all its parts." This seems to yield the winter of 1841 – 1842 as the period in question. Other relevant dates appear in "Report of Committee on a/cs on Claim of Thos. Mitchell presented Dec 23, 1843," WCCC. On 22 June 1840, Mitchell paid the firm of Mitchell & Fitler $25 for a "Plan of Woodlands," presumably the plat generated by Price's boundary surveys. On 28 July 1843, Mitchell paid $28 for "Lithograph Plans." This expenditure followed the Board's request that Price "make a Survey of the said ground" (Managers Minutes, 22 April 1843) and probably covered the cost of reproducing a more refined version of Price's "draft or plan" (see following note).

[203] The earliest surviving representations of the cemetery plan are lithographs made from a now-lost engraving. Dating them is a difficult task. Three were included with ambiguously dated documents: Release of Mortgage, Peter Bousquet to Woodlands Cemetery Company, 19 Apr 1844 (recorded 30 January 1845); Release of Mortgage, Peter Bousquet to Woodlands Cemetery Co., 29 July 1845 (no recording date); Executive Committee Minutes, 1 May 1846 – 10 April 1847 (apparently corresponding to 23 May 1846 entry); all in WCCC. A fourth, undated copy in the possession of Timothy Long is the only known version to survive uncropped and unannotated. These lithographs may be those Mitchell purchased in 1843 (see above note). However, on 5 February 1845, the company paid lithographer P. S. Duval $22.50 "for writing on Stone a plan of Woodland Cemetery and printing 300 copies" (Receipt Books). Since the surviving copies show burial lots – something the Board had requested twice in the previous year – they may well be Duval's (Managers Minutes, 13 February, 9 July 1844).

entrance lodges were shown further apart to accommodated Ridge Avenue. To the south, a spur designated Lake Avenue opened onto Lehman Street.

This was an ambitious scheme, easier to draw than to implement. Work on the site had surged forward in 1840 but ceased in 1841. In a report of 18 February 1843, Philip Price summarized progress to date:

> The whole of the carriage roads designated in the plan were actually traced out upon the ground and many of them graded amounting in aggregate length to about three miles - and being in breadth twenty feet. [P]art of the grounds was also subdivided into suitable Lots with access to each by alleys or walks…. The ground occupied by the carriage roads and drives is about seven acres, leaving about seventy one acres for lots and the walks communicating with them, from which some deduction must also be made for the buildings. The progress of the survey was suspended from the uncertainty which hung over the prospects of the Cemetery - and probably part of the lines of what has already been done will have to be retraced in cas[e] the undertaking is resumed - and a successful effort shall be made to carry out the original design of its projectors.[204]

The allusion to "uncertainty" touched on a range of financial and logistical difficulties besetting the company. Among the gravest was the managers' continued inability to procure the land on which their venture depended. This logjam finally broke in May of 1843 when mortgage-holder Peter Bousquet agreed to release land incrementally in proportion to payments on the principal.[205] The first installment would not come for another year but the promise of a solution set the venture in motion again. On 3 June 1843, the cemetery company took title to most of Hamilton's former estate.

Notably absent from this transfer was land along the waterfront. While the omission now looks like a radical departure it was actually several years in the making. During the 1830s, Thomas Mitchell had amassed over 91 acres between Mill Creek and the Blockley Alms House. The property's shoreline had been the centerpiece of his canal scheme and after this fell through he continued to treat the strip as a separate source of income, derived from coal wharfage.[206] Cemetery managers, too, accepted the distinctive status of the "river front."[207] Their 1843 purchase merely solidified this

---

[204] PMP, report to WCC managers, 18 February 1843, transcribed in Managers Minutes, 25 February 1843.
[205] Agreement between Peter Bousquet and WCC, 4 May 1843, WCCC; Managers Minutes, 6 May 1843.
[206] Agreement between Thomas Mitchell on behalf of the Trustees of the Woodlands Estate and John White on behalf of the Delaware Coal Company, 19 March 1842, WCCC. In this document, the coal company agreed to pay the trustees wharfage "for all the coal they may have an put upon the Wharves at the Woodlands on and after the first day of April next."
[207] "Plan of Conveyancing &c. in respect to the Woodlands," n.d. [before 13 July 1840], WCCC; "Grant of Authority to Trustees to Convey, and to take Certificates – from the Woodlands Cemetery Company to the Equitable Owners in payment of their interest in the lands," [after 13] July 1840, WCCC; PMP, report to WCC managers, 18 February 1843.

division, conveying 75 upland acres between Woodland and Lehman Streets. Mitchell kept the waterfront in a trust he had helped to establish and, along with the other trustees, pledged not to build any structure rising more than thirty-five feet above the high tide line without written permission from the cemetery.[208]

Vested with the necessary property rights, cemetery managers refocused their energies on the site. At their June meeting, Thomas Mitchell "presented a plan and specification of the Lodges and wall along the Woodlands Street and a palisade fence along Lehman Street" which the board approved, leaving details to the Executive Committee.[209] The latter soon handed the wall contract to mason Dennis Kennedy. His task was to build the eight-foot-high barrier that had replaced Eli Price's thorn hedges on the managers' wish list; it would take over a year to complete.[210] By fall, plans for a fence along the southeast and southwest borders were underway. The company's detailed specifications showed the structure standing eight feet tall with spiked palisades on a high skirting. When James Leslie secured the contract the following April, he agreed to execute this design with slight modifications.[211] Finally, work proceeded on the entrance. The plans Thomas Mitchell placed before the board in the summer of 1843 were likely those he had commissioned from Thomas U. Walter a year earlier. Managers seem to have taken no action on Mitchell's proposal. Rather than rebuilding the lodges, they chose simply to renovate them.[212] And while they still wanted professional advice on the gate design, it is unclear whether the scheme they resolved to seek from John Notman ever materialized or had an influence on the ironwork they subsequently purchased. In early 1845, installation of the gate allowed the company to declare: "the grounds are now enclosed and prepared for interments."[213]

Surveying proved to be a far more contentious process. Behind the conflicts lay such broad historical circumstances as the pre-professional status of landscape architecture, the involvement of multiple stakeholders, and the use of a still-novel marketing scheme. Abstract as these factors may seem, their effects were soon visible in the landscape. Anticipating Peter Bousquet's first release of ground from the mortgage, managers authorized the survey of lots between Mansion, Oak, Cypress and Elm Avenues in October 1843.[214] This area corresponded to the core of the cemetery, sections C – H and Center Circle. Work there proceeded gradually, in part because

---

[208] Deed Book R.L.L. v. 37, p. 139 and following.
[209] Managers Minutes, 3 June 1843.
[210] Executive Committee Minutes, 14 June 1843; Managers Minutes, 1 July, 30 December 1843, 17 December 1844; Receipt Books 20 September 1843 – 3 November 1846; Benjamin C. Wilcocks, Report from Managers to Corporators for the Year 1844, 4 January 1845, WCCC.
[211] Managers Minutes, 4, 11 November 1843, 20 April, 22 June, 12 September, 5 October 1844; "Specifications for the Fence at Woodlands Cemetery," n.d., WCCC; agreement between James Leslie and Woodlands Cemetery Company, n.d., 1844, WCCC.
[212] Managers Minutes, 16 November 1844.
[213] Managers Minutes, 12 September, 5 October, 8 November, 7, 26 December 1844, 1 February 1845; Receipt Books, 30 January, 4 March 1845; Wilcocks, Report for 1844; Leslie and EKP, Report for 1845. A decade later, these gates were moved to the cemetery's west entrance (Managers Minutes, 1 May 1855).
[214] Managers Minutes, 28 October 1843. The area approved for survey was precisely that released by Bousquet on 19 April 1844 (see fn. 199 and Managers Minutes, 20 April 1844).

the plan's contours were difficult to reproduce on the ground. At year's end, Philip Price estimated that one-third of the entire site had been surveyed, "which from the lines being curved must necessarily be very tedious."[215] From the start of his service, he had operated without a contract, relying on an informal agreement with other cemetery founders. Now, however, the cash-strapped board was calling for details as part of a broader internal audit.[216] Price complied but the exchange grew acrimonious and stretched into the following spring.

Meanwhile, the managers were moving forward with long-held plans to sell blocks of burial lots to churches. St. Paul's Episcopal was the first to accept one of these "allotments," followed later in 1843 by St. Andrew's. Hoping to encourage such congregations, the board granted them the right to design their own sections, subject to final review by the company.[217] This step, too, laid the way for controversy.

In March of 1844, the board directed its Committee on Accounts to determine the future costs of Philip Price's surveying "and also to receive proposals from other persons on the same subject."[218] It was an obvious rebuke. Although the managers retained Price for one more task (fixing his pay at seventy-five dollars), his tenure as lead surveyor was about to expire. His final assignment was to realize the managers' newly adopted plan for "the plot between Magnolia, Elm and Larch Avenues" – the future Section C.[219] Since previous work on Center Circle and Section E had been abandoned, this project was crucial in several respects. First, it established standard path widths: 8 feet for major axes and 5 feet for secondary routes. It also yielded the first permanent scheme for burial lots, an important commodity if the church-wooing plan was to succeed. Now that several company shareholders had subscribed for lots on their congregations' behalf, they needed measured ground on which to stake their claims. The southwestern end of Section C thus went to St. Paul's while the northeastern corner went to the Church of the Epiphany.[220]

Other shareholders wished to claim ground in their own names, hoping to profit through resale when the cemetery opened its gates. Toward that end, the managers made several clarifications in the fall of 1843. Center and South Circles were off limits to shareholders, as were several other areas the company perceived as key sources of its own revenue stream. Shares might be redeemed for lots in Section D, initially designated for sale to "individual lot holders" (as opposed to those buying in under church auspices). And, looking forward to the start of retail sales, land prices were set at fifty cents per square foot except in the more exclusive South Circle (seventy five cents) and Center Circle (one dollar).[221] Lack of demand and of

---

[215] PMP, Report to WCC Managers, 30 December 1843.
[216] Managers Minutes, 2, 30 December 1843.
[217] Managers Minutes, 7 October, 2 December 1843,
[218] Managers Minutes, 2 March 1844.
[219] Managers Minutes, 13 April 1844.
[220] Managers Minutes, 23 March, 6 April, 22 June 1844. Both churches had been under the ministry of Rev. Stephen Tyng, whose second wife, Susan Mitchell, appears to have been Thomas Mitchell's daughter; see *American National Biography* (online), s.v. "Tyng, Stephen Higginson."
[221] Managers Minutes, 4 November 1843.

surveyed ground tended to undermine such proclamations. By the following summer, Section D had been reassigned to St. Andrew's Church. Lots reserved for individual sale were instead located in Section E, re-surveyed later in the year by Price's successor, Edward D. Roberts. Free of church ties, this section was where shareholders finally staked their first private ground claims.[222]

The interests of shareholders, churches, and the company were not so easily reconciled. In August of 1844, the board approved a plan of the St. Andrew's allotment only to reverse itself two months later. At issue was a path along Section D's eastern border. The congregation wanted a serpentine design like the one Philip Price had shown further to the east on his general plan for the cemetery. On second thought, manager Garrick Mallery had decided that a straight path would "best suit the adjoining lots and the descent of the ground." A committee formed to settle the matter with church representatives. Then, despite a compelling letter of protest from vestryman John Pechin, the board overruled the church on a three-to-one vote.[223]

A different sort of contest developed between investor rights and corporate responsibilities a year later. Although a second release from Bousquet's mortgage had freed up land closer to the cemetery's periphery, the number of measured burial lots was dwindling and several shareholders were eager to satisfy their claims.[224] The time had come to lay out a new section. Managers settled on the former "park lawn" north of the mansion and, in November, assigned the necessary surveying to Edward Roberts.[225] Section F now appeared to be under way. But slow progress raised the question: how well was the company balancing its long-term need for capital improvements against shareholder wishes for short-term enrichment? Eli Price spoke from the broader perspective in a letter of 26 March 1846:

> I have enclosed some lots in a circle South East of the house, with the view chiefly of promoting some improvement near the house, of a neat and suitable character. There is a corresponding circle opposite, at the southwest of the house, which is to be enclosed in the same manner, to make uniform improvement. The object of this is to invite the company or any individual desirous of taking the ground to make this improvement. If no one else desires to do it, I am willing to undertake [it], but would prefer the company or someone else doing it.[226]

---

[222] Managers Minutes, 10 August, 27 September, 2 November 1844. Receipt Book entries for 7 May, 3 July, 9, 25 September, 4 October 1845 show shareholders made their earliest ground claims in this section. The following document was apparently prepared to facilitate the process: *Contents of Lots, Section E. Woodlands Cemetery*, n.d., WCCC.

[223] Managers Minutes, 10 August, 12, 26 October 1844.

[224] Release of Mortgage, Peter Bousquet to WCC, 29 July 1845, WCCC; Executive Committee Minutes, 27 October 1845.

[225] Managers Minutes, 4 November 1845.

[226] EKP to WCC Managers, 26 March 1846, placed on Executive Committee Minutes.

Price was referring to two small circles immediately in front of the mansion's portico – prime burial real estate but in quantities too limited to attract much interest. Perhaps in response, majority shareholder Thomas Mitchell wrote in June:

> Seeing that nearly the whole of the lots that have been Surveyed and laid out have been engrossed, I ask the board in justice to others who have equal rights that I be permitted by resolution to procure a design of the Section of the Cemetery bounded by Hamilton, Mansion, Larch, Cedar and Centre Avenues, and when approved by the Board that any portion thereof be assigned to such shares as I may be authorized to locate thereon.[227]

By consenting to this request, cemetery managers effectively withdrew Roberts' assignment and allowed company land to develop through private initiative.[228] Only in time would Section F be brought back into the corporate fold. Meanwhile, Mitchell moved quickly. Within three weeks he had commissioned a design from Thomas Ustick Walter who drove out to inspect the site. After two more such trips, Walter produced a grand, axial scheme that stretched across the mansion's north lawn while responding to Center Circle with a group of nested crescents. The board approved this plan on July 7th, four days after Walter had finished it.[229]

Section F's fate probably revealed more about Thomas Mitchell than about broader company – shareholder relationships. Once the sole owner of The Woodlands and still invested in its fate, he was slow to relinquish the proprietor's role. By the time he laid claim to the park lawn, he had been wrangling with managers over other parts of the property for nearly two years. At his request, they had agreed to cut down William Hamilton's screen of cedars along Mill Creek in order to furnish material for James Leslie's fence.[230] Then, starting in late 1844, Mitchell asserted ownership of the garden statuary, "declaring it as well as other chattels his property and denying the right of the managers to sell it even if it were the property of the Corporation."[231] The solution presumably satisfied no one. Managers sold the statues to marble mason James McClaranan but assigned the note, payable in work, to Mitchell.

---

[227] Thomas Mitchell to WCC Managers, 2 June 1846, WCCC.

[228] Believing the company had driven him to this step through its inaction, Mitchell expressed anger at having to hire his own workmen. He also intimated that the board had advertised ground in the new section behind his back. See Thomas Mitchell to WCC Managers, 25 September 1846, WCCC.

[229] Thomas U. Walter Diary, 22-26, 30 June, 1-3 July 1846. Although Walter "Finished Mitchell's drawing" on 3 July, cemetery records show the board approved the design on two separate occasions (Managers Minutes, 7 July, 1 December 1846). The latter approval may have involved a more detailed plan completed without Walter's assistance. On 20 April 1847, the board ordered a plan of the section "numbered and lithographed" (Managers Minutes; see also Receipt Books, 10 June 1847, listing payment to Wagner & McGuigan for 300 lithographed copies). The project's equally complex accounting history may reflect tensions between Mitchell and the board. Mitchell paid Walter $50 for his efforts on 3 July 1846 and was promptly reimbursed by one of the managers (loose receipt, WCCC). However the Executive Committee did not authorize payment of Walter's bill until 2 November 1847, and the payment itself went unrecorded until 25 July 1848 (Executive Committee Minutes, Receipt Books).

[230] Managers Minutes, 12 September 1844.

[231] Managers Minutes, 2 January 1845; see also 26 December 1844, 15 January 1845.

Development Phase II: 1845 - 1852

It was in this fractious context that company president Benjamin Wilcocks bemoaned "the want of harmony & unanimity in the board."[232] Yet, in retrospect, the mid-1840s were a turning point toward greater managerial control. With the board's approval, Robert Devine settled into his role as cemetery superintendent after working there as a laborer for some time.[233] Further professionalization of site management came in October when William Carvill received a lease for the greenhouses. An English-born nurseryman and florist, Carvill had distinguished himself by planting the grounds of Haverford College.[234] His lease placed him in charge of ten acres along the cemetery's western side and obliged him to "improve the said premises and make the Green-houses and grounds round them ornamental and attractive by cultivating flowers - and laying out walks and beds in a tasteful manner."[235] When disputes began to erupt between Devine and Carvill, the Executive Committee stepped in to define the duties of each.[236] Increasingly, that committee also showed itself capable of guiding the cemetery's design. By January of 1845, Eli K. Price could report that he and James Leslie had met with Devine and instructed him on tree maintenance, road building, and gravelling.[237]

The plan to promote lot sales by partnering with churches not going well. Although the cemetery had tentative agreements with five congregations by the spring of 1845, little had come of these overtures.[238] At the end of the year, Eli Price observed wistfully: "But one Congregation, - Grace Church, - has done anything towards promoting burials in the Woodlands; although circulars have been sent to them generally. Our reliance must be mainly on individuals who may purchase lots…."[239]

An enduring preference for churchyard burial may have factored in this lackluster response. If so, the problem was surely compounded by The Woodlands un-cemetery-like appearance.[240] While Hamilton's house bore material witness to a bygone age, this hardly substituted for the monuments and epitaphs of conventional commemorative landscapes. Aware of the shortcoming, Woodlands managers turned to an established rural-cemetery strategy: they opted to dignify their grounds with the

---

[232] Wilcocks, Report for 1844.
[233] Ibid. The board established the superintendent's position on 28 October 1843 (Managers Minutes). On Devine's prior employment, see "Report of Committee on a/cs on Claim of Thos. Mitchell"; Receipt Books, 20 Sep. – 4 Nov. 1843 and following.
[234] *A History of Haverford College for the First Sixty Years of Its Existence* (Philadelphia: Porter & Coates, 1892), 93, 109, 130, 141, 150, 287, 535-536.
[235] Lease from WCC to William Carvill, 23 October 1844, WCCC. See also Managers Minutes, 12, 14 October 1844; Wilcocks, Report for 1844.
[236] Managers Minutes, 26 December 1844; 15 January 1845.
[237] Executive Committee Minutes, 22 January 1845.
[238] Managers Minutes, 1 April 1845; Executive Committee Minutes 1 July 1845.
[239] Leslie and EKP, Report for 1845.
[240] *Philadelphia as It Is. The Stranger's Guide to the Public Buildings, Institutions, and Other Objects Worthy of Attention in the City of Philadelphia and Its Environs* (Philadelphia: for sale by Geo. S. Appleton, 1845), 25.

remains of local worthies. Military heroes took precedence. A failed attempt to obtain the body of Commodore Stephen Decatur in 1844 led to more concerted efforts the following year.[241] By March, the board was planning to re-inter General Thomas Robinson and Dr. John C. Otto, both of whom had family ties to the company.[242] The remains of Commodore David Porter were also deemed desirable. Should the managers obtain this prize relic, they resolved to raise funds for a monument, request a eulogy from Whig statesman Joseph Ingersoll, and ask another company friend, Rev. Stephen Tyng, to conduct the funeral ceremony. Porter's relatives obliged. His corpse arrived in April, "having been, at the request of his widow, delivered by order of the Secretary of the Navy."[243] Interred in Center Circle, Porter had the final honor of being the cemetery's first burial; Otto, however, received the first monument. Like Otto, Robinson was buried in Section E. His body was accompanied by those of his grandchildren and other relatives, creating that all-important fixture of rural cemeteries: the hallowed family lot.[244]

Slowly, the institution was gaining momentum, performing the function it was designed to serve. Yet illustrious dead would remain important to the cemetery's prospects. Hallowing unconsecrated ground with patriotic associations, they drew mourners, tourists, and potential lot-buyers who otherwise had little reason to travel outside the city. Woodlands managers acknowledged these benefits in several ways. Borrowing money for Porter's monument, they commissioned an imposing, eagle-crested column from James McClaranan at considerable expense.[245] In time, they also offered free lots for military officers killed in the Mexican War.[246]

Such investments in symbolism and history went hand in glove with practical improvements. Upon examining the receiving tomb near the mansion, the Executive Committee deemed it "too damp" and moved to retrofit the old ice house for the purpose.[247] Other Hamilton-era structures were refurbished, too, largely through the efforts of carpenter and manager James Leslie. Summarizing progress in January of 1846, Eli Price observed: "The present buildings during the past year have all been roofed, and in other respects repaired, by Mr. Leslie. The lodges have had new floors and windows and a second story placed in them; the receiving vault in Centre Circle has been floored and roofed, and the mason work partly reconstructed, and an iron

---

[241] Wilcocks, Report for 1844.
[242] Managers Minutes, 28 March 1845. Robinson appears to have been the father of a corporator by the same name. Otto was Garrick Mallery's father-in-law as the board made clear when thanking Mrs. Mallery "for the chaste and elegant monument erected to the memory of her honored father" (Managers Minutes, 7 October 1845).
[243] Executive Committee Minutes, 10 April 1845. Porter's remains were disinterred from a grave at the nearby U. S. Naval Asylum; see "The Cemeteries of Philadelphia. – Woodlands Cemetery."
[244] Executive Committee Minutes, 15 April, 3 June 1845; Managers Minutes, 7 October 1845; Leslie and EKP, Report for 1845. On family lots, see David Charles Sloane, *The Last Great Necessity: Cemeteries in American History* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), 70-71, 83-84, 94-95.
[245] The company paid McClaranan $350 in cash and 1,000' in cemetery ground. Although managers had initially hoped to raise the cash payment through subscription, they ultimately borrowed the sum (Managers Minutes, 7 September 1847; Receipt Books, 6, 13 September, 27 October 1847).
[246] Managers Minutes, 7 December 1847.
[247] Executive Committee Minutes, 5 May 1845.

door put on it; the mosaic platforms [on] both sides of the mansion re-laid; the glazing and painting partly done; and the outside of the mansion and lodges it is proposed to plaster in the Spring, when further repairs inside the house will be proper."[248]

Flowers were integral to the wider beautification program. While little could have remained of Hamilton's beds or terrace plantings, others took their places. John Cochran, tenant of one of the lodges, lavished attention on his environs and earned praise for "improv[ing] the borders of the Avenue at the entrance…in very good taste."[249] Gardener William Carvill likewise focused on the area around the mansion. Thanks to him, beds of dahlias flanked the portico, another bed graced the carriage turnaround, and yet another was planned for the west gate.[250] Strangely absent from the records is the name of Henry Dreer. Although the famous florist had his nursery and green houses at The Woodlands from 1839 until 1850, the cemetery apparently gave Carvill a near-monopoly when it came to flowers.[251]

Watertight buildings and blooming beds were conspicuous improvements but did little to make The Woodlands more convincing as a cemetery. Roads were key here, as the Executive Committee well knew. In the summer of 1845, that body "felt justified in throwing out the dirt in the Avenue through the grounds leased to Mr. Carvell, as it is important to shew the entire plan, and in a decree [sic] incorporate the garden with the Cemetery."[252] So began a new round of road building and a long series of run-ins with Carvill. Immediately at issue was the construction of West Gate (or West Mansion) Avenue. Following roughly the same route as Hamilton's farm road, this straight passage effectively scuttled plans for the serpentine Birch Avenue envisioned by Philip Price. Carvill considered the project an intrusion until managers stressed the necessity of an integrated road system. Other steps toward that goal occurred in rapid succession throughout the year. Mansion, Maple, Vault, Elm, and Cedar Avenues were all "graded, gravelled and rolled" to various extents; Center Circle Avenue joined them after workers filled a large hole in its path. Of the major routes that would define the cemetery, only Oak Avenue awaited completion. This came two years later.[253]

Planting was a more prolonged and complex process, requiring managers to balance preservation of the Hamilton legacy against the needs of modern business. A

---

[248] Leslie and EKP, Report for 1845.
[249] Executive Committee Minutes, 3 June 1845. See also Executive Committee Minutes, 5 May and 1 September 1845, and Leslie and EKP, Report for 1845.
[250] Executive Committee Minutes, 1 July 1845.
[251] Evidence of Dreer's tenure is remarkably scant. City directories list his nursery at The Woodlands and *Dreer's Garden Book, Hundredth Anniversary Edition* (Philadelphia, 1938), n.p., supplies the date range. The cemetery's only recorded transaction with him is a seed purchase (Receipt Books, 16 June 1846).
[252] Executive Committee Minutes, 3 June 1845.
[253] Executive Committee Minutes, 22, 30 January, 5 May, 3 June, 1 July, 1 September, 15, 28 November 1845, 31 May, 30 June, 21 August 1847; Leslie and EKP, Report for 1845; EKP, Report from Executive Committee to Managers for the Year 1847, 1 January "1847" (sic; 1848). It is worth noting that Pine Avenue, the westernmost road in Philip Price's plan, was at least partially graveled in 1846 before slipping into disuse and all but disappearing (Executive Committee Minutes, n.d., November 1846).

persistent priority was to create the sense of privacy and enclosure on which rural cemeteries depended. While William Hamilton had timed visitors' tours to conceal the Schuylkill River's mudflats, the Executive Committee took no such chances. In 1845, they spent a November afternoon "planting Cedar trees near the junction of Elm & Schuylkill Avenues, the purpose of which was besides the immediate ornament, to interpose a screen between the house and mud when the water is at low water mark."[254] Another cedar screen went up along the cemetery's wall. By year's end, frontal views would have included this phalanx, four balm of Gilead trees behind the gate, and a group of evergreens planted by tenant John Cochran on a newly filled marsh near the west lodge. Further into the grounds, an eclectic array of trees took root. Cedars lined Cedar Avenue, creating a solemn but hopeful approach to Center Circle; (eternal verdure comported well with Christian notions of the afterlife). A more cheerful effect was achieved through the use of dogwoods and catalpas around the entrance to Schuylkill Avenue.[255]

As in Hamilton's day, plant materials came to the site through commercial nurseries, hired gardeners, and a network of amateur botanists. Now, however, it was Eli K. Price who oversaw these transactions. Reporting to fellow corporators on the developments of 1845, he noted: "In order to have a proper supply of young trees, and by exchanges to increase the variety, a small piece of ground has been broken up east of the Lodges."[256] This was the first step toward an on-site nursery, plans for which matured in the following year. The reference to "exchanges" suggests the array of personal and mercantile contacts on which Price intended to rely. His earliest sources included John B. Turner, gardener Patrick Kereven, Colonel Robert Carr of Bartram's Garden and "Miss Wild Sch[uylki]ll Front & Vine Sts."[257]

The year 1846 witnessed the first bulk purchases of greenery for Woodlands Cemetery. Turner provided some 300 trees, 164 of which were balm of Gileads. Then came roughly 1000 trees and shrubs from a Mr. Levy and the same quantity from Patrick Kereven, "nearly all Evergreens, Balms, norway pines, Cyrpress, hemlock, etc."; (the latter arrived by raft somewhat the worse for wear and their number was later revised to 735).[258] Again, the overwhelming emphasis was on evergreens. Most were planted along cemetery roads "to afford shade along them, and to supply the place of old trees as they disappear by age."[259] Screening, while still a priority, had shifted away from the street and river elevations and so could be undertaken with less valuable species. Thus, when Eli Price called for "a screen of

---

[254] Executive Committee Minutes, 15 November 1845.
[255] Executive Committee Minutes, 5 May, 15, 28 November 1845; Leslie and EKP, Report for 1845.
[256] Leslie and EKP, Report for 1845. See also Jacob Lex and Charles E. Lex, Report from Managers to Corporators for the Year 1846, n.d., WCCC.
[257] Leslie and EKP, Report for 1845; Executive Committee Minutes, 5 May 1845; Receipt Book, 8, 10, 12 May 1845. On Carr, see *From Seed to Flower*, 37.
[258] Executive Committee Minutes, 7, 17, 18 April, 1, 2 May 1846.
[259] Lex and Lex, Report for 1846.

evergreens…to shut out the glaring appearance of the Alms house," he added: "Pines are best for this object, and they can be had from the woods."[260]

Price's horticultural knowledge had expanded since the time of his letter to David Townsend. He was now familiar with local nurseries' stock and equally prepared to call upon peers. An entry in the 1847 Executive Committee Minutes suggests this versatility: 'Have planted 13 Elms, 1 Pine near gate, two Spruce firs, 1 balm of gilead, ten English Ash, two weeping Ash, two white birch, and three copper beaches [sic], procured from place of Marmaduke Cope…and twelve Cypress trees, procured from [nurseryman David] Landreth's…."[261] The same principle applied to seeds. As Price noted with pride: "Seeds of the Sugar Maple furnished by Isaac Hazelhurst Esq. from his father's place at Mount Holley [sic], and of the American Linden from Independence Square; and of the English Sycamore from the Woodlands, have been planted."[262] Later on, Price's cousin would send the cemetery "a cart load of box trees" and a friend would supply "two English Silver firs."[263]

Price's attitude toward William Hamilton's landscape garden was respectful but pragmatic. As a horticulturist he appreciated Hamilton's accomplishment and understood the dignity it lent the cemetery. At the same time, he did not hesitate to rearrange or eliminate venerable features when he saw fit. The decision to screen the house from the river had received his approval in 1845. Three years later, he noted in passing: "many shrubs from near the old English walk have been distributed over the ground."[264] Meanwhile, outright removal of trees was occurring with increasing frequency. Price explained such actions as necessary because of the trees' age or the threat they posed to monuments (black oaks were a particular target). Other trees were cleared because they "came in the footways."[265]

Before most of these changes came to pass, Price had composed a lengthy theoretical justification for them. What prompted the statement remains unclear. (An oblique reference to "remarks…made by persons who have but seldom visited the grounds" is the principal clue).[266] In any case, it was here that the man who held greatest sway over the cemetery's final appearance set forth his philosophy of landscape gardening.

The essay opened with an exegesis of the principles behind the general plan. Moving quickly through such practical considerations as lot accessibility, Price launched into

---

[260] Executive Committee Minutes, 7 April 1846. This screen may have been the destination of the "100 silver pine trees obtained…from the forest" that Price helped to plant the following year. On the other hand, he was still seeking trees for the same purpose in 1848 (Executive Committee Minutes, 10 April 1847, 12 April 1848).
[261] Executive Committee Minutes, 28 April 1847. On Landreth, see also Receipt Books, 9 July 1847; *From Seed to Flower*, 69.
[262] Executive Committee Minutes, 31 May 1847.
[263] Executive Committee Minutes, 1 November 1848, n.d. [May?] 1849; EKP and James Leslie, Report for the Year 1848, [n.d.] January 1849, WCCC.
[264] Executive Committee Minutes, 12 April 1848.
[265] Executive Committee Minutes, 2 October 1847; see also 30 September, 19 December 1847; 1 November 1848, n.d. [May?] 1849, 25 December 1850.
[266] EKP, Report for 1847.

a defense of the road system, taking care to explain the reasons for employing both straight and curving lines. Here, economy and taste dictated adherence to topography: "It is a rule in landscape gardening where there is ample space, and an irregular surface to follow a varied style of improvement. This avoids stiffness and monotony, Conforms to the Character of the ground and is therefore natural, and its Convenience evinces a motive for what is done that is satisfying and pleasing to the mind."[267] Sanction for this stance came from no less an authority than J. C. Loudon. Turning to *The Suburban Gardener, and Villa Companion*, Price excerpted and underlined Loudon's dictum: "that when the ground to be laid out as a garden is large, it may be laid out in any style, and partly in the regular and partly in the irregular styles; and that where the surface of the ground is varied, the irregular style is most suitable; while the geometrical style should be preferred when the surface is even and flat."[268] The cemetery plan, then, was a literal translation of this idea. Curving avenues traversed the "varied surface" that characterized three quarters of the site; "the plainer mode" took over toward the flatter western end.

While these passages were a patient defense of his brother's work, Eli Price saved his greatest eloquence for the discussion of trees.

> Fine growths of these were found at the Woodlands: Some Covering the lawn as in parks, some in woods, in Clumps, groups and singly. These are pleasingly varied and produce an impressive effect. The Committee have sacredly respected these ancient occupants of the soil, whether the self sown oaks of the forest, or the pines and firs brought from our mountains, the rarer exotics; and have so Cut the avenues and walks as to spare every one of material value, and to bring them into the view of visitors, and to obtain their welcome shade.

Here was the language of preservation, still a new strain in American thought.[269] Like Thomas Cole, James Fenimore Cooper, and poet George P. Morris, Price embraced a Romantic view of nature that sanctified old-growth trees. Unlike these writers, however, Price extended this veneration beyond pristine forest into the realms of history and artifice: his references to trees "brought from our mountains" and to "the rarer exotics" were a nod to Hamilton and to Philadelphia's botanical past. Historian David Schuyler has traced this "merging of history with landscape" in New York's Hudson River Valley, tying it to contemporary Whig notions of intergenerational responsibility.[270] The model fits neatly enough. Price was certainly a Whig, as were most of his fellow managers. Yet the Whig outlook contained contradictory impulses, too. It was, according to Daniel Walker Howe, "a synthesis

---

[267] Executive Committee Minutes, 30 June 1847. The essay also appears in EKP, Report for 1847.
[268] The passage is from J[ohn] C[laudius] Loudon, *The Suburban Gardener, and Villa Companion* (London: Longman, Orme, Brown, Green, and Longmans, pr., 1838), 169.
[269] Roderick Nash, *Wilderness and the American Mind*, 3rd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), chap. 6, *passim*.
[270] David Schuyler, "The Sanctified Landscape: The Hudson River Valley, 1820 to 1850," in George F. Thompson, ed., *Landscape in America* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995), 105-106.

of rural morality with urban economic dynamism."[271] Again, Eli Price might serve as a case study. For even as he developed the case for preservation, he attempted to reconcile history and primeval sanctity with modern needs.

> Trees as well as men are mortal and in time must too mingle again with the earth whence they have sprung; and in proportion to size great and destructive may be their fall, among the costly tombs and enclosures of the dead. Whenever, therefore, danger is seen to impend, they must from time to time be removed. A few such, but with a sparing hand, have been removed by the Committee. To supply their places others must be planted; and also further planting of trees has become necessary where the avenues have struck through the open lawns, to afford the shade, required by our heated summers. Hence it becomes a necessary care to Consider the kind of trees most proper to be introduced, and their disposition in reference to their effect upon the landscape should always be the subject of careful attention. In view of the destruction that may be produced by the prostration of large trees - those of small or middling growth should be favored. The more these are varied in kind the more will be the variety to please the taste of general observers and also to gratify the scientific research of the botanist. Thus the progress of planting may in time produce a material change in the wooded scenery of the place, unless, indeed, the proprietors of lots should by observing an humbler and more Chastened taste avoid the Construction of Costly monuments and enclosures, which is not to be expected from the well known principles of human nature.

In the course of this strange passage, Price moved from an almost Transcendentalist analogy between human and plant life cycles to a gradualist recipe for "material change" in the landscape. Weaving these strands together was the idea of conspicuous consumption, itself a kind of natural force. But the process was not passive; further along, Price set forth the opposing elements. On one hand stood the company's rolling site, blessed with expansive views and conceived "on a grand scale and of magnificent effect." On the other hand were "The thousands of lot holders [who] may have respectively but their lot of 10 by 16 feet, in which their interest and feelings are chiefly centered, and with devoted affection for the dead, erect a costly monument, and enclosure, and Cultivate it according to their own taste with assiduous care." How to reconcile these disparate scales and worlds, the landscape of bygone gentility with the landscape of middle-class mourning and displaced domesticity? The immediate solution lay in "the paramount power of the Company." This need not, however, be iron-fisted. Lot holders might freely indulge in "the Cultivation of flowers and shrubs that do not rise to a height to vary the landscape or obscure the prospects." The company would bide its time, intervening when lot holders turned to

---

[271] Daniel Walker Howe, *The Political Culture of the American Whigs* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), 117.

tree planting and even here treading softly. For instance, when lot owners planted trees "stiffly in the four angles of their lot," the resulting effect might be offset "by planting at a short distance irregularly so as to throw the whole into an irregular group." In this way, the company became a paternalistic intermediary, tempering narrow individualism with corporate breadth of vision.[272]

Price was aware that he was proposing something new. In seeking to reconcile "these extremes, never before so united in landscape gardening," he emphasized the remedial nature of the company's role, yet there was a creative side, too. Again, he sought to naturalize it through analogy:

> The larger trees may be gradually harmonized with the smaller by intermediate planting, making the transition as to size as well as in Colour and other characteristics easy and varied until they sink to the shrub and flower on the lawn: or the shrub and the flower may be found directly beneath the aspiring tree as an undergrowth, whose protecting shade may not be uncongenial in our own burning climate: And this we find to be an arrangement of nature even in our more densely shaded forests, where the honeysuckle and Countless shrubs and flowers deck the earth.

Loudon and other landscape theorists had addressed the problem of transition but in different contexts and terms.[273] Price's strategy sounded almost like government policy. It set forth a flexible corporate aesthetic that sat uneasily under existing stylistic labels. Price himself was careful to skirt the issue. Noting that A. J. Downing's Picturesque was unsuited to the Woodlands, he continued:

> It is rather the graceful order of improvement that we should wish to observe, with our rounded hills Covered with trees that give them greater apparent elevation, but so sparsely as to permit beneath a verdant sod, and road sides shaded with trees so distant as to allow to each ample space for the natural and most graceful development of its form, yet not so disposed as to give formality and stiffness of appearance, but rather to follow the winding of the way with ease and grace. These scattering trees, as well as those that Stand out singly on the lawn, will more or less connect the wooded hills, yet with occasional breaks so as to keep open the vistas from the centre elevations of ground, to the water, and other distant prospects.

---

[272] This theme is reiterated with particular force in EKP, Report from Managers to Corporators for the Year 1851, n.d. [3 January 1852, as reported in newspaper clipping pasted in Executive Committee Minutes], WCCC.

[273] See, for instance, Loudon's instructions on laying out the grounds of suburban residences, where he states: "groups of aged trees among groups of shrubs do not unite so as to form a whole, without the introduction of trees of intermediate size" (147). If Price seems to echo this passage, it is as important to note that Loudon would have quickly rejected any proposal in which indigenous species appeared to mimic naturally occurring plant formations (136-141).

The description leaned toward Downing's notion of the Beautiful.[274] Again, though, in the context of Price's manifesto it was something more. What he had in mind was an institutional dynamic, a recipe for thoughtful change. Drawing on contemporary landscape theory, he put fellow managers and potential critics on notice that trees would be cut, but not without reason. Tree removal and replacement were part of a larger process in which the individual and collective, the venerable and the market-driven would all receive due consideration. Thereafter, this idea became a leitmotif of the company's annual reports.[275]

While the intensive phase of cemetery road-building had spanned a year, tree planting took roughly three times as long. The protracted schedule stemmed partly from Eli Price's special interest in the subject, partly from the planting season's limited duration, and partly from the need to observe a particular sequence. Most of the early purchases had been hardy evergreens used in rows along roads and boundary lines. These created a framework for later embellishments. In 1848, cedars, pines, spruces, and cypresses continued to arrive.[276] Now, however, they were joined by an increasing variety of deciduous and ornamental trees, largely from William Carvill's stock. Price recorded purchasing 106 trees from Carvill in April: "They are large growth Consisting of silver poplars, varieties of horse chestnut; dark & light sugar maples, silver and ash leaved maples, English and Turkey Oaks, American and English Lindens &c."[277] Close on this group came "over one hundred" ornamentals. Here Price commented: "The supply of trees is now as large as will be wanted, except to increase the variety by occasional purchases, and some evergreens, to shut out the view of the Alms house…."[278]

Another sector of cemetery development in which Price involved himself was drainage. The first step in this direction was an extensive soil survey he undertook in the spring of 1846. Noting, "I spent the afternoon with an auger at the Woodlands," he recorded the results of twenty samples ranging from "pure mica sand" in the southeast corner to "yellow gravel" in the northwest.[279] Clay turned up in near the middle of the site, notably in Section F. Still less welcome was the moisture found in sandy soil east of Section E. Had Price ventured further south he might have struck

---

[274] Eli Price's eclectic style also bore traces of Loudon's "gardenesque" but was not strictly concerned with specimen planting or solely "calculated for displaying the art of the gardener" (Loudon, 161). For concise discussions of these categories see George B. Tatum, "The Beautiful and the Picturesque," *American Quarterly* 3, no. 1 (Spring 1951), 41-48; idem, "The Emergence of an American School of Landscape Design," *Historic Preservation* 25, no. 2 (April – June 1973): 34 – 41.

[275] Reports for the years 1847 – 1852 all reiterate the themes of preservation and transition, usually in the context of tree removal. For instance, in EKP, Report from Managers to Corporators for the Year 1849, 31 December 1849, WCCC: "In all they do the Company is careful to keep in view the original character of the Scenery, _and also the individual lots will be ornamented as small garden spots,_ to preserve the park like appearance of the whole; the lofty tress being so sparsely scattered as to give entrance to the sun and consequently verdure to the lawn."

[276] These came principally from Landreth's nursery, Executive Committee Minutes, 30 March 1848.

[277] Executive Committee Minutes, 8 April 1848.

[278] Executive Committee Minutes, 12 April 1848.

[279] Executive Committee Minutes, 23 May 1846.

water. This area was not on the itinerary but it was the target of drain-building efforts that commenced in 1847. The campaign produced seven-foot-deep culverts east of Elm Avenue and similar channels along Elm and Magnolia Avenues, drying out Section C.[280] In the following year, operations shifted toward the northeast where damp ground near the bridge was being watered by springs. Robert Devine dug some 400 feet of drains here but more work was needed in the area in 1850. Not until 1851 did the managers address the dampness Price had found east of Section E, and then action came at the behest of an irate lot owner.[281]

Factors such as elevation, soil type, and moisture content influenced managers' decisions about the location of future burial lots. Low-lying areas, though less desirable, were not dismissed out of hand. As early as the summer of 1845, the board resolved that a patch of ground just east of Elm Avenue be devoted to individual graves as opposed to the larger, more expensive family lots found in other sections.[282] A standard feature of rural cemeteries, these diminutive parcels sold initially for $7.50. After a year of sales, the managers noted: "A portion of that space was known to be wet in certain seasons."[283] Although they reassured corporators that the ground was "generally of white or gray sand, easy to dig, and suitable for burial," it was probably no coincidence that the first drains were soon laid nearby. Drain building also affected the establishment of new sections elsewhere in the cemetery. Created in 1847, Section G lay in a clay-bottomed valley between Oak and Cedar Avenues; it probably benefited from Robert Devine's subsequent trench digging to the northeast.[284] Devine's project must have had a more direct impact on Section I. A recent hire named Francis Lightfoot surveyed the eastern end of that large tract starting in late 1850, yielding the first burial lots a year later.[285]

Reprising a familiar theme in the spring of 1847, Eli Price wrote: "Something further seems necessary to extend over the grounds the Character of a Cemetery and give a more decided impression of its future appearance. The Cost of the work will probably repay the expenditure in its ultimate results."[286] This reflection may have seemed optimistic at the time but it proved prescient. Investments in relics, roads, trees, and drains turned William Hamilton's private estate into an accessible commemorative landscape and lot sales grew accordingly. In 1845, a mere twenty

---

[280] Executive Committee Minutes, n.d. December 1846, 6 April 1847; EKP, Report for 1847.
[281] Executive Committee Minutes, 19 January, 9 February 1848, 1 December 1850, n.d. February 1851; Managers Minutes, 4 February, 4 March 1851; EKP, Report for 1848; EKP, Report from Managers to Corporators for the Year 1850, 4 January 1851, WCCC; EKP, Report for 1851; R. Gardiner, Philadelphia, to WCC Managers, 5 November 1850, WCCC.
[282] Managers Minutes, 19 August 1845. On single graves, see Sloane, 54, 84.
[283] Lex and Lex, Report for 1846.
[284] The board authorized work on Section G in May of 1847 and ordered the resulting plan lithographed the following April (Managers Minutes, 4 May, 7 September 1847, 4 April 1848; Executive Committee Minutes, 21 August, 30 September 1847; EKP, Report for 1847; Receipt Books 26 April 1848).
[285] Managers Minutes 7 September 1847, 3 December 1850, 9 July 1852; Executive Committee Minutes, 15 December 1850, n.d. [fall] 1851; EKP, Reports for 1850, 1851; Receipt Books, 4 August, n.d. October 1851. Users of these records should note that the name Section I was first applied to today's Section H and then only to the eastern end of what became Section I (Managers Minutes, 1 April 1851).
[286] Executive Committee Minutes, 31 May 1847.

interments had occurred. Burials then jumped from sixty-seven in 1848 to 320 in 1851, bringing the cemetery's total deceased population to 799.[287] Even churches now showed greater confidence. Sixth Presbyterian took 15,000 feet of ground in Section I, and though St. Andrew's formally abandoned its allotment in 1852, First Reformed Presbyterian soon offset this loss by buying into Section E.[288]

Equally crucial to the cemetery's success was a series of transportation-related projects outside the walls. Woodland Street (or Darby Road, as it was still sometimes called) had grown into an important artery since Hamilton's day but passage along it remained rough and unpleasant into the 1840s. Cemetery managers were aware of the problem from the outset. Their first push for a solution came in the summer of 1845 when the Executive Committee lobbied other interested parties to join in a far-reaching improvement effort. Writing to the Guardians of the Poor, they explained the company's desire to see Woodland Street graded, given sidewalks, and adorned with trees, then urged the Guardians to "set the example" in front of the Almshouse.[289] Eli Price soon assumed the role of emissary. He kept up pressure on the Guardians by mail and in person while meeting with Blockley Township's Road Commissioners to arrange grading in front of the cemetery. That work edged forward over the coming months with public and private funds. Closer to the city, landowner Edward Burd agreed to let the company "plant trees in front of his lot beyond Chestnut Street" – a case of long-distance beautification.[290]

Grading alone was only the start. When James Leslie furnished the managers with a list of "indispensably necessary improvements" in 1847, he gave top priority to "a good Turnpike of Stone 25 feet wide from Chestnut Street to the Starr Tavern or to our Gates."[291] Three years later, the company subscribed for twenty shares in the Delaware Turnpike Company. The result, while not quite what Leslie had envisioned, pleased the managers nonetheless: a double-track plank road that did indeed stretch from Chestnut Street to the cemetery gates. By legislative act and private agreement the cemetery company obtained free passage for its staff and for funerals.[292] Another windfall came in the form of modifications to Philadelphia's Market Street bridge. In 1850, the structure was redesigned to exclude locomotives, easing passage for carriages, hearses and other vehicles. All of this helped

---

[287] EKP, Reports for 1849 and 1851;

[288] Managers Minutes, 12 March 1851, 1 March 1853; EKP, Report for 1851; Receipt Books 4 August 1851; H. F. Blair to WCC Managers, 12 March 1851, WCCC; Vestrymen of St. Andrew's Church [to WCC Managers], 2 March 1852, WCCC; D. W. Denison, Secretary of Board of Trustees, First Reformed Presbyterian Church, to J. B. Townsend, WCC Secretary, 6 June 1853, WCCC. Sixth Presbyterian obtained lots 1 –80 in Section I. First Reformed Presbyterian (initially referred to as First Associate Presbyterian in the minutes) obtained lots 38 – 49 in Section E.

[289] Executive Committee Minutes, 4 July 1845, containing copy of Committee's letter to Guardians.

[290] Executive Committee Minutes, 2, 11, 17, 20 September, 1, 7, 27 October 1845; Receipt Books, 18 October, 1, 15 November 1845; Lex and Lex, Report for 1846. Managers also authorized the Executive Committee to work with West Philadelphia's Borough Council and the Delaware County Turnpike Company (Managers Minutes, 19 August 1845) but it is unclear how far these negotiations proceeded.

[291] James Leslie to WCC Managers, 4 May 1847, WCCC.

[292] Managers Minutes, 4 May, 6 July 1847, 5 June 1849, 19 October 1850; Executive Committee Minutes, 25 December 1850; Receipt Books, 28 September, 2 November, 2 December 1850; EKP, Report for 1850.

Woodlands compete with the area's growing number of rural cemeteries. Undertakers particularly appreciated the ease of access and, by late 1852, the managers reported that Woodlands Cemetery was "now so well established and of such constant resort and use as to have become familiar and a well understood routine of business, of easy approach by plank road, and an attractive terminus held in view to solicit custom to lines of omnibuses."[293]

The cemetery's environs were changing rapidly now. Buildings tied to Hamiltonville, William Hamilton's early subdivision, were increasingly engulfed by new kinds of suburban development within the District of West Philadelphia.[294] As the grid marched westward, Woodlands managers guided its growth to their advantage. Pressing District commissioners to bend the south end of William Street (39th Street) toward the cemetery gates, they emphasized that Hamilton himself had envisioned this jog in his plan. Their lobbying apparently resulted in a compromise: the street veered east on one side but ran straight on the other, forming a triangular plaza in front of the entrance lodges.[295]

Founded by title lawyers, conveyancers, and related specialists, the Woodlands Cemetery Company had close ties to antebellum Philadelphia's real estate market. If such expertise was an asset in dealing with government agencies, it also gave the board an unsentimental view of urban growth, as the sale of the "river front" to the West Chester & Philadelphia Railroad soon demonstrated. Railroad president John S. Bowen portrayed the deal as a boon to lot holders, presumably because they could travel on the new line.[296] Eli Price stressed other considerations to his business partners in late 1851:

> The principal disadvantage, perhaps the only one, is the loss of ground, exceeding in quantity two acres. The benefits proposed are - that the Rail Road will build a wall to support the bank of the Cemetery…which will give a well defined out line and finish to the Cemetery, and add to the security of the premises by the frequent transits on the road. The prospect of benefit to the waterfront is that it will bring into use for shipment of Coal &c. of the wharves made and to be made…In as much as a street will someday be laid alongside the rail road, and…the best use of the

---

[293] EKP, Reports for 1850 and 1851; EKP, Report from Managers to Stockholders for the Year 1852, n.d. December 1852, WCCC; R. A. Smith, *Philadelphia as It Is, in 1852* (Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston, 1852), 363.

[294] Roger Miller and Joseph Siry, "The Emerging Suburb: West Philadelphia, 1850 – 1880," *Pennsylvania History* 46, no. 2 (April 1980): 102-117; Rosenthal, 12-15.

[295] EKP to Commissioners of West Philadelphia, 6 July 1852, letterpress, WCCC; Managers Minutes, 9 July 1852; *A Complete Atlas of the City of Philadelphia*, Joseph H. Bonsall and Samuel Smedley, Surveyors and Draftsmen (Philadelphia, 1860). This plaza existed on paper long before it took shape on the ground. On related damage claims, see EKP, Reports from Managers to Corporators for 1871 (n.d.) and 1873 ([n.d.] January 1874), WCCC.

[296] John S. Bowen to WCC Managers, 17 November 1851, WCCC (note accompanying map). Despite Bowen's suggestion, there is no evidence that WC&PRR trains stopped at Woodlands Cemetery.

> wharves will be for the turn-outs to be at a height to admit of shutes, I have got the rail road to give a more uniform grade on the Woodlands than its Engineer had first intended.[297]

Price spoke as both a cemetery manager and a trustee of the waterfront property. His language suggests Lehman Street and the wharves had fallen into disuse but remained prime industrial real estate, ready for development as a coal transfer station. In early negotiations with the railroad, he assumed the trustees would retain what remained of their parcel once the right-of-way was sold. By the spring of 1852, however, the trustees and the cemetery (which owned only a fraction of the land in question) had decided to relinquish both the proposed track-bed and the waterside "business space," placing the latter under tight restrictions. The latter offer a fascinating window on contemporary industrial nuisances and an attempt to abate them through an early form of viewshed protection.[298] Reworking a prior internal agreement, the sellers limited building heights to thirty-five feet above the river's high tide line (not including chimneys). They also banned "any lime kiln, slaughter house, distillery, glue factory, skin dressing or soap boiling establishment, chemical works, noisy iron works or any establishment or manufactory which shall produce noxious vapors or offensive smells or smoke other than the smoke of anthracite coal."[299] The sale, then, was not a wholesale surrender of the cemetery's views or ambiance.[300] It amounted instead to a pragmatic gesture shaped by previous land uses. Nor did Price stand by as track construction progressed. Ever defensive of the cemetery's trees, he shot off angry letters when these faced harm and in other ways sought to protect company assets.[301]

Development Phase III: The 1850s

The 1850s were a period of intensive construction at Woodlands Cemetery, allowing the institution to refine its image and achieve high standing in Philadelphia society. With basic features such as roads and trees in place, the managers could turn their attention to visitor conveniences, greener grass, and a more impressive entrance gate. Other factors made this shift possible, too. The cantankerous Thomas Mitchell died in 1849 (an event notably absent from the minutes). A longstanding conflict with gardener William Carvill reached an end, freeing up spaces he had occupied. And, most importantly, company profits were fast outstripping expenditures. As Eli K.

---

[297] EKP to WCC and Equitable Owners of the River Front of the Woodlands Estate, 15 December 1851, letterpress bound in Executive Committee Minutes.

[298] These restrictions amounted to an early form of suburban zoning. Strikingly, their application to the cemetery's waterfront apparently predates their use in neighboring residential developments (discussed in Miller and Siry, 118).

[299] Woodlands Cemetery Co. et al. to Robert Irwin, 17 August 1853, Deed Book T.H. v. 103, p. 335. These terms incorporate the 1843 height restriction (Deed Book R.L.L v. 37, p. 139 et seq.) and first appear in "Memoranda for a Conveyance of the Woodlands front," 6 May 1852, WCCC.

[300] On the contrary, Price confidently listed "restrictions to prevent nuisances or obstructions to the prospects from the Cemetery" among the company's accomplishments for 1853 (Report from Managers to Corporators for the Year 1853, n.d., loose-leaf letterpress, Executive Committee Minutes).

[301] EKP to Hon. A. V. Parsons, 18 November 1851; EKP to John Rutter, Esq., 14 September 1853; EKP to John Rutter, Esq., 15 September 1853 (letterpress); all in WCCC. See also EKP, Report for 1851; Managers Minutes, 15 December 1851, 5-6 May 1852, 3 May 1853.

Price explained to the stockholders in 1852, dividends were poised to exceed six per cent per annum, risking a steep increase in taxation. The best way to avoid this eventuality would be to sink capital into improvements.[302]

Five years earlier, carpenter James Leslie had compiled a list of projects he believed the board should undertake when funds allowed. His inventory is significant not only because it included most company-sponsored "improvements" of the following decade but also because it advocated a kind of architectural preservation that complemented Eli Price's landscape philosophy. After calling for a turnpike on Woodland Avenue and a stone coping on the front wall, Leslie exhorted the managers to "Improve the Old Mansion Still retaining its Anteaque appearance…And fit up the large room for A Chapell, and Build such lodges at the Entrance Equal if not Superior to those at Laurell Hill or Monument Cemetereys, and remove Old Buildings, Sheads, fences and dead trees, which only mar and Obstruct the unsurpassed natural Buties of the grounds."[303] Like Price, Leslie understood that Hamilton's architectural legacy was crucial to the rural cemetery venture. Since this realization fostered a sensibility rather than a set of rules, it left considerable room for interpretation.

The principal object Price had in mind when he addressed the stockholders was a grander main entrance. Betraying a genteel fear of ostentation, he reiterated the importance of antique appearances – now as a guide to new design:

> Our Mansion, which as the principal object in architecture, should give character to the smaller buildings; Its style is Grecian, and the present lodges conform with it. It would be out of taste and keeping to put an entrance building in the gothic style. A filling in of the space between the lodges by three ornamented arch ways, one large in the centre for Carriages and two for footpassengers on each side, with the proper relief in the surfaces and suitable entablature, would seem to be in keeping with the mansion, and without a large expenditure do all that is required to making a pleasing and effective entrance. Let us not forget that it is the extent and variety of our scenery that is our great and sufficient attraction, and that we need not the imposing effect of costly architecture to give significance and importance to our Cemetery. Let those which need them resort to artificial aid to give them pretension and claim to patronage, and thus make up for their limited space and want of scenery. Here architectural piles would mask or divert attention from more attractive or appropriate objects, or produce but a diminished effect in contrast with them. The most effective in the beautiful and sublime is the simple and natural, which pretentious and expensive ornament but mars and brings in question the good taste of the projector. This is not, however, said to discourage further improvements in a subdued

[302] EKP, Report for 1852.
[303] Leslie to WCC Managers, 4 May 1847.

> taste and in a proper subordination to the existing features of the place, which were the original motive of its attraction and choice for the object to which it has been devoted. These we should change only as we are assured we can improve and fit them more closely to the purposes of a Cemetery.[304]

Advocating thrift, taste and gradualism in his usual manner, Price evidently envisioned a triple-arched screen fitted between Hamilton's old lodges. This modest plan was short-lived. While the board did indeed shun the sort of vertiginous Gothic Revivalism on view at Philadelphia's Monument Cemetery, the design they eventually adopted was neither "subdued" nor subordinate to other cemetery buildings.[305] Conceived by architect John McArthur, Jr., it would cost over $25,000 to execute – a staggering sum by contemporary standards. But if fiscal restraint fell by the wayside, Price's emphasis on historical context resonated more deeply. In time, it produced a sophisticated architectural statement for an increasingly competitive rural cemetery market.

The board moved to "procure plans or designs for a new Entrance" in November of 1853. Seven months later they hired McArthur whose experience with similar commissions may have added to his allure.[306] At first glance, his scheme exemplified the sort of blunt one-upmanship espoused by Leslie and eschewed by Price. Flanked by lodges and a low exedra, it rose into a massive triumphal arch, taller than Laurel Hill's and built of ashlar, not rubble and wood. The façade would require expert craftsmanship. Colossal Roman Doric columns, tightly fluted and crowned with rosettes, supported a strikingly simple entablature. Three vaulted passageways cut through the central pavilion while to either side stood the one-story lodges, their rusticated quoins repeating the deep joints of the base. Much of the composition could be construed as a reworking of Laurel Hill or of a pattern-book figure published by Loudon.[307] But closer inspection revealed quirks. Most obvious were the lodges' roundels and niches, echoing similar features on the mansion and stable. The four great columns seemed transposed from the mansion's portico; the two-story arch evoked the stable's main entrance; and so on went the game of historical reference, displaying the ingenuity with which McArthur interpreted the board's instructions.

---

[304] EKP, Report for 1852.

[305] Monument Cemetery's flat terrain and Gothic Revival entrance were the likely targets of Price's jibes. The site is discussed in Robert W. Torchia, "No Strangers to the Ravages of Death: John Neagle's Portrait of Dr. John Abraham Elkinton," *Nineteenth Century* 18, no. 2 (Fall 1998): 13-15.

[306] Managers Minutes, 1 November 1853, 5 June 1854. McArthur received $100 for his "Plan for improvement of Entrance already furnished and for working drawings necessary for the construction of the same" (Receipt Books, 26 July 1854). By this time he had gained notoriety through an array of institutional commissions and designed the main entrance for South Laurel Hill Cemetery (1849). See Wunsch, "Laurel Hill Cemetery," 50; *Philadelphia Architects and Buildings Project* (online), s.v. "McArthur, John, Jr."

[307] Fig. 1785 in John Claudius Loudon, *Encyclopedia of Cottage, Farm, and Villa Architecture and Furniture* (London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, Green and Longman, 1833). The illustration seems to have influenced the design of Laurel Hill's entrance. I base this hypothesis not only on visual similarities but also on a modified copy of the book belonging to the Library Company of Philadelphia where John Jay Smith, Laurel Hill's principal founder, served as Librarian).

None of this came cheaply. McArthur had specified granite for the front of his building and the board was determined to comply. In early 1855, a committee assigned to the matter recommended financing construction and "other improvements" through a loan of up to $35,000. Managers subscribed their own funds on two separate occasions and sought outside aid as well. Meanwhile, after careful research, the board settled on Rockport granite and hired builder Solomon K. Hoxie to work it. His bills, eventually totaling $17,000, suggest the scope of his task; (to help cover the cost, he, too, lent the company money). But there was more to the structure than its façade. The sums lavished on Hoxie were inversely related to those spent on other contractors, giving the side and rear elevations a stark, industrial appearance that could hardly have pleased McArthur. Mason John M. DuShane handled the ordinary stonework, while carpentry went to Thomas Baxter. Their efforts wound down in mid 1857, leaving the company proud, indebted, and unsure how to use their new lodges.[308]

By the time the grand entrance reached completion, work had moved forward on other parts of James Leslie's wish list. The departure of gardener William Carvill provided the immediate catalyst for several of these projects and came as a great relief to the board. Known by his previous employer for certain "peculiarities of disposition," Carvill had obtained use of Hamilton's conservatory and the western halves of the mansion and stable in exchange for agreeing to repair and beautify these buildings and their environs.[309] One source of conflict surfaced when Carvill began sparring with Superintendent Robert Devine over their respective duties. To what extent should the gardener be allowed to involve himself in (and profit from) the planting of private burial lots? At first the board vowed to assist Carvill in securing this work, but then continued squabbling led to an 1849 resolution that "a sign be put up at the Mansion lettered thus 'All Planting, Sodding, &c. to be done by the Superintendent Robert Devine.'"[310] Carvill had been relegated to the role of florist. Another point of contention was access to the mansion. As early as 1846, the board began trying to remove Carvill from the building for reasons that are not entirely clear. Hopes of using the saloon as a chapel may have factored in their decision, and although that room was already excluded from the lease, they ordered it cleaned and locked in 1848.[311] All of these issues came to an ugly head around 1850. The cemetery's eviction case wound up in the State Supreme Court while Carvill sued the company for a litany of damages, heaping anti-Irish slurs on Devine in the process.

---

[308] Managers Minutes, 20 January, 6, 21 February, 1 May, 3 July, 7 August 1855, 19 September 1856; Receipt Books, 1855-1860, passim. On granite selection and working see also James Leslie and William W. Keen to WCC Managers, 22 February 1855; bid of Keay & Brown [n.d.]; bid of John M. DuShane, 23 April 1855; all in WCCC. The west lodge went to an unpaid gatekeeper who was soon evicted (though eventually replaced); proper use of the east lodge was the subject of prolonged debate (Managers Minutes, 5 January 1858, 3 May 1864, 3 July and 5 September 1866, 12 March 1867).

[309] *History of Haverford College*, 141; lease from WCC to William Carvill, 23 October 1844.

[310] Managers Minutes, 6 November 1849. On the buildup to this decision, see also 26 December 1844, 15 January 1845, 27 May and 5 June 1849.

[311] Managers Minutes, 4 August 1846, 6 June 1848.

When Carvill finally left in 1853, Eli Price dryly described the development as "a gain to the Cemetery."[312]

With Carvill gone, the company bought back his lease and pressed forward with renovations. Demolition of the aging greenhouse complex in 1854 made way for a large octagonal carriage shed, built of stone and covered with a double-pitch roof like those seen on Quaker meeting house sheds throughout the region.[313] This was a stroke in favor of modern needs. Coinciding roughly with the removal of Hamilton's entrance lodges, it again suggested the malleability of the company's preservation ethic. Happily, the mansion proved better suited to adaptive reuse. In September of 1854, the company paid William Githens thirty dollars for "calcinning walls & ceiling of chapel," indicating the fruition of a long-held plan. Augmenting the saloon's quasi-religious atmosphere were windows furnished by Philadelphia's leading stained glass maker, John Gibson, the following year.[314]

A large part of Woodlands Cemetery's appeal derived from the site's relationship to water. As in William Hamilton's day, views of the meandering Schuylkill, "pursuing its winding course as far as the Delaware in silvery brightness," inspired poetic meditations, now colored by the Christian symbolism that the rural cemetery movement attached to rivers in general.[315] Eli Price was loath to detract from this majestic prospect by creating lakes or pools within the grounds. Moreover, any "impression of dampness" ran counter to the company's aims. And yet, Price concluded in late 1852, a small irrigation pond would "express its own purpose" and thereby prove suitably inoffensive.[316]

---

[312] Managers Minutes, 3 July 1849, 4 February 1850, 4 October 1853; Executive Committee Minutes, 1 December 1849; EKP, Reports for 1849, 1851, 1853; rough minutes from "Woodlands Cemetery vs. Sprague," 30 March 1850, and "Carvill vs. Cemetery," 12 April 1852, WCCC; "Woodlands Cemetery Co. vs. Carvill et al.," (Philadelphia) *Legal Intelligencer* 9 (18 June 1852): 98. Final citation courtesy of Donna Rilling.

[313] Managers Minutes, 11 May, 14 June, 8 August 1854; EKP, Report from Managers to Corporators for the Year 1854, n.d., 1855 [?], laid in Executive Committee Minutes, WCCC; Receipt Books, 1 and 15 November 1854, 9 April 1855, 5 July 1856.

[314] Receipt Books, 23 September 1854, 14 November 1855. An earlier purchase of 28 church benches appears to have been made in anticipation of the chapel's establishment (Managers Minutes, 3 February 1852) and bells had helped sanctify the grounds since the start of the decade (Receipt Books, 22 May 1851). On Gibson, see Jean M. Farnsworth, "Stained Glass in the Philadelphia Archdiocese: Reflections of Faith and Culture," and "Appendix 2: Biographical Sketches of Stained-Glass Studios and Selected Artists" in Jean M. Farnsworth, Carmen R. Croce, and Jospeh F. Chorpenning, eds., *Stained Glass in Catholic Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: Saint Joseph's University Press, 2002), 130, 434-435. I am grateful to Michael Lewis for pointing me to this source.

[315] EKP, Report for 1852. On the metaphorical importance of riverside locations in the rural cemetery movement, see Sloane, 76-77; Colleen McDannell, "The Religious Symbolism of Laurel Hill Cemetery," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 111, no. 3 (July 1987): 280.

[316] EKP, Report for 1852.

By the time Price shared these sentiments with company stockholders, the board had already formulated plans for a waterworks in which ponds played a part.[317] The system that took shape in the following year drew water from Middle Run into a round, brick-lined collecting pool just south of the main entrance. This reservoir functioned like a millpond, turning an overshot wheel and hydraulic ram that filled a second reservoir on top of the receiving vault (now remodeled for a second time). From there, gravity fed a constellation of hydrants used to water lawns and flowers.[318] The arrangement was remarkable on several fronts. In a narrow sense, it updated the wood-pipe scheme James Hamilton had installed forty years earlier. More broadly, it helped turn the 'city of the dead' into a city of systems, already drained through one network and now irrigated by another. What made the urban analogy especially apt was the board's unstated decision to reproduce Philadelphia's public waterworks in microcosm. The technological similarities were obvious enough. In 1855, Price clinched the architectural connection when he told the corporators: "a neat temple like building covers the wheels that drive the water to the reservoir."[319]

Drain construction proceeded much as before. Perennial moisture problems in Section C were the focus of one project in early 1854; another soon cut through Section E. Such efforts suggest that, despite the site's central rise and many slopes, water might linger. This seems to have been the case east of Section E where Eli Price had found damp sand during his survey. Work performed there in the early 1850s was successful enough that managers designated the area as Section H, paying Francis Lightfoot for a new round of surveying near the decade's close. But no sooner had Lightfoot completed the task than a culvert proved necessary.[320]

Meanwhile, an old and well-drained section was assuming new form. Philip Price's original plan for Center Circle called for a twisting quincunx likely meant as a shrubbery or flower garden. Drawing on conventions that Humphrey Repton brought into the nineteenth century, Price had placed a similar feature in his previous cemetery designs and may have considered it a sort of signature.[321] Little evidence survives to explain why the board abandoned this scheme. It certainly made for difficult surveying, and though Price's immediate successor may have tried his hand at the work Francis Lightfoot did not. Final say rested with the managers, of course.

---

[317] Managers Minutes, 9 July, 7 September 1852; William Bucknell, Jr., to EKP, 10 August 1852, WCCC (estimate of hydraulic ram's cost). On further developments, see Receipt Books, 28 May, 11 June, 15 July, 8 October, 1 and 5 November 1853, 18 September 1854.

[318] EKP, Report for 1853. See also *A Complete Atlas of the City of Philadelphia.*

[319] Eli K Price, Report for 1854. There is reason to believe this diminutive temple was one of William Hamilton's follies. In an entry of 18 September 1854, the Receipt Books record a payment to William S. Lewis for "removing building from near the stables and placing the same over the waterworks." Woodlands managers were not alone in adapting the public waterworks idea to a private estate. Nicholas Biddle had undertaken much the same project at Andalusia in the 1830s; see Lockwood, 351.

[320] Managers Minutes, 3 January 1854, 6 October 1857, 7 June 1859, 3 July 1860. Established in 1857, Section H appeared in a lithographed plan the following year (Receipt Books, 17 June 1858).

[321] On the European origins of this feature, see Mark Laird, "*Corbeille, Parterre* and *Treillage*: the Case of Humphrey Repton's Penchant for the French Style of Planting," *Journal of Garden History* 16, no. 3 (Autumn 1996): 155 – 159.

They made up their minds in the spring of 1855, replacing Price's convoluted paths with a simple cross-and-circle pattern.[322]

If the design of the waterworks was a subtle acknowledgement of the cemetery's growing urbanity, there were also more obvious symptoms. Visitors were arriving in greater numbers, prompting a string of new regulations from the board. Tickets became mandatory for Sunday admission in 1852. Lot owners received their share automatically, but the managers dolled out public allowances at their discretion and eventually extended the ticket requirement to the rest of the week.[323] Since the company did not maintain visitation statistics, there is no simple yardstick of the institution's popularity. Still, telling evidence survives in other forms. Addressing the corporators in 1853, Eli Price commented: "The thorn trees planted within the wall towards the west end should be laid and plashed so as to make a thick thorn hedge" – an added deterrent to trespassers.[324] Omnibus operators were prohibited from bringing their vehicles onto the grounds, presumably in response to such incidents. And, in one lively five-week period, the board decided to ban refreshments and seek "police assistance" from the Mayor.[325]

Lot-holders began to treat the site as so much urban real estate. Left to their own devices, they tended to build fences at the extremities of their plots, prompting managers to require a six-inch setback along the narrower paths. A related trend was the growing demand for street frontage. Early in the decade, the board stepped forward to prevent buyers of multiple lots from claiming more ground along an avenue than they took "in depth therefrom."[326] Later, managers turned the same instinct to profit, selling roadside lots at a premium.[327] What was the appeal? A plaintive letter to the company from one Miss E. Randall's accountant gives some idea. The unfortunate young woman had purchased a lot for her mother site unseen, only to discover that "the position will not allow of the amount of Embellishment she desires to bestow upon it." For such a problem there was only one solution: "She wishes now Two Graves side by side on the front tier, & if possible on higher ground, so that she can devote herself easily to their full arranging, beautifying, &c."[328]

---

[322] Managers Minutes, 10 May 1855; Receipt Books, 29 December 1855 (lithograph), 27 December 1856 (surveying). This work obscured prior efforts to implement Price's design as recorded in Managers Minutes, 7 September 1847; Executive Committee Minutes, 21 August, 30 September, 2 October, 1 November 1847; EKP, Report for 1847; Receipt Books, 25 August 1851.

[323] Managers Minutes, 4 May 1852, 8 October 1858. The ticket rule may have been laxly enforced when the board ordered it removed from company advertisements a decade later. However, it was revived and observed in the 1870s (Managers Minutes, 4 May 1869, 3 December 1878). On the broader historical context of such rules, see John Brinckerhoff Jackson, "The American Public Space," *Public Interest* 74 (Winter 1984): 57; Blanche Linden-Ward, "Strange but Genteel Pleasure Grounds: Tourist and Leisure Uses of Nineteenth-Century Rural Cemeteries," in Richard E. Meyer, ed., *Cemeteries and Grave Markers: Voices in American Culture* (Logan [UT]: Utah State University Press, 1992), passim.

[324] EKP, Report for 1853.

[325] Managers Minutes, 5 December 1854, 2 June and 7 July 1857. See also J. B. Townsend to "Messrs. Stephens 7 Buchanan" (omnibus proprietors), 5 December 1854, WCCC.

[326] Managers Minutes, 3 June 1851.

[327] Managers Minutes, 6 October 1857, 6 April 1858, 5 June 1866, 2 September 1873.

[328] James H. Snethen to WCC Managers, 29 May 1856, WCCC.

Miss Randall was not alone in wanting more embellishments. During the cemetery's early years, taste in monuments had favored simple forms. White marble tablets were common, while obelisks represented the high end of the consumer spectrum. Even old-fashioned slate sometimes made an appearance: when remains were removed from churchyards, gravestones often came with them. All of this began to change in the 1850s. Manufactures such as Thomas Hargrave continued to supply the standard obelisk on a rusticated base. But now those who could afford better sometimes purchased ornate reworkings of this basic form. Henry McKeen's family opted for a vaguely Romanesque version, while Hezekiah Buzby's preferred Gothic panels and a Greek key. New, quintessentially Victorian types also arrived: the broken column, the downward-gazing angel, the Egyptian vault. An 1852 guidebook drew visitors' attention to "those 'Tombs in the French style,' i.e. with head and foot stones, and beautifully carved side slabs, presenting the appearance of a couch."[329]

The spread of such designs pleased Eli Price, who praised the "large expense and good taste" that had come to characterize lot adornment.[330] But the trend also revealed reused stones as an alien presence. Writing as "A Well Wisher," an anonymous lot owner complained of "100 old fashioned stones, broken, dirty, & cracked, stuck topsy turvy, sidewise, & lengthwise, all close together, & behind each other in a lot 10 by 16."[331] Churches may have been the company's first target market, but churchyard aesthetics had little place in the modern rural cemetery.

Development Phase IV: 1860 – 1875

Woodlands Cemetery's mid-century monuments were eclectic, even self-contradictory. A taste for neoclassicism held over from previous decades, and while the republican austerity of Commodore Porter's monument was on the wane, Roman iconography remained popular. Louisa Breedin Frazier's sarcophagus announced 'life extinguished' with its inverted torches. Wreathes, urns, and winged hourglasses appeared, and might end up together on a single monument. Moreover, there was no clear separation between pagan and Christian symbolism. Despite the efforts of aesthetes and theologians, obelisks supported crucifixes and open bibles accompanied overturned pitchers.[332]

Opulence continued to increase. A Renaissance Revival canopy for the Harris family eclipsed a Greek Revival canopy for Samuel George Morton (now demolished).[333] The Suddards and Manuel families commissioned a sprawling Tudor mausoleum decked with marble statuary. Architect John Kutts supplied undertaker William H. Moore with a Gothic design in which niche-bound statues of "Charity, Mercy, &c."

---

[329] R. A. Smith, *Philadelphia as It Is, in 1852*, 363.
[330] EKP, Report for 1854.
[331] "A Well Wisher & owner of Lots" to WCC Managers, n.d. [1850s], WCCC. On the context of such objections, see Sloane, 92; Blanche Linden-Ward, "Putting the Past Under Grass: History as Death and Commemoration," *Prospects* 10 (1985): 303-305.
[332] On monuments of this era, see McDannell, 292-299; Ames, 651-655.
[333] Early photographs of both monuments survive at the Library Company of Philadelphia.

were dwarfed by a large finial (D-33).[334] (Advertising was the idea here, since Moore, also a manager of the cemetery, had many years ahead of him). Nonetheless, poorer dead found their way in under the umbrella of charitable institutions. The stratification resulting from these divergent patterns was a hallmark of the post-Civil War landscape.

War itself revealed new social distinctions. As nearby military hospitals filled up with wounded soldiers, the cemetery offered free graves in the "general interment" section east of Elm Avenue, charging only for digging and permits. It was a patriotic gesture, but it soon provoked unease. Would the federal government exploit the generous terms? Would it pay for a monument and substantial enclosure? In the summer of 1862, Eli Price wrote to Colonel Crossman of the U.S. Army, notifying him that the company would need to start charging for ground once the number of burials exceeded 100. "This conclusion is formed from no indisposition to provide for the soldiers and to serve the Government but under a sense of the duty we owe the shareholders, knowing as we do that other Cemetery companies are willing to make a proportionate contribution to the public."[335] The question of lot treatment persisted. First the managers formed a committee on the subject. Then, several years after the war's end, they refused to issue a deed for the soldiers' ground, holding out for "some plan of improvement that shall confer more honor upon the soldiers and more credit upon the Cemetery than that proposed by the Government."[336]

All of this stood in contrast to the company's policy on officers. From an early date, the board had sought out the remains of military elites, burying them in prominent locations and helping to pay for their monuments. This tradition continued in the 1860s. Major-General David Bell Birney, admittedly loved by his soldiers and spectacularly mourned at his funeral, received a subsidized lot in Center Circle. Another lot on Center Circle's periphery went to Captain Courtland Saunders, toward whose black granite obelisk the cemetery contributed $100.[337]

However, in the larger scheme of the cemetery's development, such scenarios were rare. It was civilians, unassisted by the company, who built the grandest tombs, and in this regard the Drexel family set a new standard. The clan made its fortune in banking. When Francis Martin Drexel died in 1863, his relatives set out to erect an impressive mausoleum and spared little expense in obtaining it. After rejecting Gothic and Roman Revival proposals from the firm of Collins & Autenrieth, they settled on a Doric temple with a tetrastyle portico, built of smooth white marble and

---

[334] "The Cemeteries of Philadelphia. – Woodlands Cemetery." The monument's advertising function is underscored by its appearance as one of two illustrations in *Charter, By-Laws, and Regulations of the Woodlands Cemetery Company* (1868 ed.). Moore died in 1887.

[335] EKP to "Col. Crossman," 3 June 1862 (copy), WCCC. See also Managers Minutes, 12 December 1861, 4 March and 3 June 1862.

[336] Managers Minutes, 3 May 1864, 4 February 1868.

[337] Managers Minutes, 1 November 1864, 5 September 1865, 3 April 1866. On Birney's funeral, see [Oliver Wilson Davis], *Life of David Bell Birney, Major-General United States Volunteers* (Philadelphia: King & Baird, 1867), 292-294.

ringed by a matching fence.[338] Much of the structure's monumentality and meaning derived from its site. This lay directly southwest of the Hamilton mansion, from which vantage-point it was impossible to miss the two buildings' formal similarities or their parallel alignments. Portico echoed portico, new wealth saluted old, and contemporary photographers enjoyed the relationship.[339]

As the first great monuments to nineteenth-century capitalism went up at The Woodlands, so did the first displays of philanthropy. The Preston Retreat, a lying-in hospital for indigent women, bought lots in Section I in 1866. Several years later, the board donated ground to the Lincoln Institute "for burial of inmates dying there."[340] Of all such institutional sections, though, it was the so-called Printers' Cemetery of the Philadelphia Typographical Society that intrigued the press with its architecture and social message.[341] George W. Childs, publisher of the *Public Ledger*, was a proud advocate of worker welfare. When he gave the printers' union some 2000 square feet in Section E, the act occasioned an elaborate dedication ceremony in which former printer and State Supreme Court Judge Ellis Lewis proclaimed:

> Mr. Childs provides for the comfort and health of his employés during life. He secures an insurance on their lives for the benefit of their families after death. And even then he does not desert them. He provides this beautiful and magnificent burial lot for the repose of their lifeless bodies forever.[342]

The Printers Cemetery was not the first of its kind (the Society owned ground at Ronaldson's and Monument cemeteries). It was, however, the most impressive. Costing Childs roughly $8,000 after improvement, the lot faced Magnolia Avenue with a marble fence and Gothic arch that appear almost luminous in period views. By 1871, the *Ledger* could report, "The lot is well cared for, being surrounded by boxwood and evergreens. There are now seven graves within this enclosure."[343]

---

[338] Edward Collins and Charles Autenrieth probably conceived this design, too, but positive attribution is impossible without further documentation. The domed Roman Revival proposal is filed with other works by the firm in the Special Collections of the University of Delaware Library. The Gothic Revival scheme survives in a photograph at the Athenaeum of Philadelphia. Both resemble the executed design in massing and roofline. See also Managers Minutes, 1 September 1863 (board approves design); *Philadelphia Architects and Buildings Project* (online), s.v. "Collins, Edward."

[339] Contemporary photographs capturing the buildings' relationship include a print by Robert Newell and an anonymous stereograph, both at the Library Company of Philadelphia's Print Department.

[340] Managers Minutes, 5 April 1870; on other institutional lots, see 1 May 1866, 1 October 1867.

[341] For discussions of the Printers' Cemetery, see *The Public Ledger Building, Philadelphia: with an Account of the Proceedings Connected with Its Opening June 20, 1867* (Philadelphia: George W. Childs, 1868; expanded edition), 187-205; "The Printer's Cemetery near Philadelphia," *The Ladies' Repository* 3, no. 5 (May 1869): 360-361; "Liberality," *Godey's Lady's Book* 81 (August 1870): 185; George A. Stevens, *New York Typographical Union No. 6: Study of a Modern Trade Union and Its Predecessors* (Albany: J.B. Lyon Co., 1913), 499.

[342] *Public Ledger Building*, 200.

[343] "The Cemeteries of Philadelphia. – Woodlands Cemetery." See also two stereographs by John Moran in the Print Department of the Library Company of Philadelphia.

While hosting demonstrations of largesse, the cemetery itself faced mounting debts. Loans taken to finance the new entrance remained unpaid; (William Moore alone had lent $16,400).[344] Meanwhile, development in the surrounding neighborhood was booming as the panic of 1857 receded. Water pipes now lined Woodland Avenue. If paving and curbing followed, the company would likely be saddled with the cost. This, at least, was the argument managers advanced to defend their own plans for a speculative residential subdivision in the early 1860s.[345] Two decades earlier, they had shelved the makings of a similar scheme after Philip Price warned it would "greatly mask and impair the beauty of the grounds."[346] Now, they stressed, construction would be confined to the cemetery's northwest corner. The parcel overlooked Hamilton Terrace, a fashionable new development on 41st Street designed by architect Samuel Sloan. One block to the east lay Woodland Terrace. Its uniform Italianate duplexes might have been what cemetery managers had in mind as they made their case to the public.[347] Using the same building type, their project would ostensibly increase security *and* spread the benefits of park-side living:

> A heavy wall will still close the Cemetery on the same side, near which no building will be erected, and the houses on the front will be built in pairs, with open spaces between them; consequently, the occupants of the houses, while they will enjoy the prospects and free circulation of the air over the Cemetery grounds, will be its friendly protector.[348]

The exegesis was part of an uphill public relations campaign. In another bid to ally lot-holder fears, several managers obtained contracts on land further to the southwest; what the cemetery lost on one flank it might gain on another. Lot owners were unimpressed. Determined to fend off an unwelcome intrusion, they organized in April of 1863 and successfully lobbied the legislature to repeal authorization of the project. Nine months later, the company formally abandoned its plan.[349]

Yet the debt burden remained. If public opinion precluded suburban developments for the living, some promise still lay in premium lots for the dead. Meeting in the summer of 1865, managers empowered the Executive Committee to create "two sections towards the northwest portion of the grounds for sale exclusively to

---

[344] Receipt Books, 22 March 1860.
[345] Minutes of the Corporators of Woodlands Cemetery, 4 January 1862 (interleaved with Managers Minutes; cited as Corporators Minutes hereafter); Managers Minutes, 7 October 1862; "Special Notices – The Woodlands Cemetery," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, 14 April 1863.
[346] The cemetery's founders considered leaving a 150' gap between their property and the outer margins of the Woodlands tract (Managers Minutes, 13 July 1840). This would have permitted the Trustees of the Woodlands Estate to ring the cemetery with building lots, an idea Philip Price explicitly discouraged in his report of 18 February 1843 (Managers Minutes, 25 February 1843).
[347] Miller and Siry, 115-122. Of potentially greater significance in this context were similar houses at 4009 – 4018 Pine Street, developed in the early 1860s by Woodlands Cemetery corporator and manager John C. Mitchell (idem, 124).
[348] "Special Notices – The Woodlands Cemetery."
[349] Clippings dated 14 and 15 April 1863, Campbell Coll., v. 19, p. 149, HSP; Corporators Minutes, 2 January 1864.

purchasers."[350] The land in question may have included the notorious Woodland Avenue front. In any case, James C. Sidney soon managed to extract not two but three sections from it.

This was Sidney's specialty. A British-born cartographer, architect, and civil engineer, he was one the nation's most foremost rural cemetery designers by the time he came to The Woodlands.[351] His suggestions for the site were commensurately bold. Reporting to the board on 5 June 1866, he called for a wholesale reworking of the grounds.[352] Grading was necessary at the entrance. The nearby collecting pond conveyed the impression that "Springs and wet ground must exist"; it would have to be drained. A carriage road should run through the valley, providing scenic lots for vaults. Another should "start at the Entrance and run among the knolls." And these were the less drastic proposals. Alluding to the cemetery's supposed reputation for neglect, he concluded that the best land for burial lay beneath the mansion, stable, and carriage sheds. Respect for the site's natural beauty dictated their removal.

When it came to the new sections, Sidney was more pragmatic. The largest lots, he suggested, should occupy the highest ground. Grouped into a single section, they would line six-foot-wide paths spaced at alternating distances. The two lower sections suffered from their proximity to Woodland Avenue and the front wall. Sidney thus suggested "planting a thick belt of trees (especially evergreens) between the Wall and the new drive," the location of which he did not describe.

Sadly, Sidney's master plan has been lost. Happily, most of its provisions went unrealized. Strapped for cash, the managers approved grading near the entrance and asked the architect to indicate burial lots on his drawing. Their attention then turned to fundraising. If any part of the new terrain had a ready market, it was the high ground. Maybe reducing lot size there would accelerate sales and deliver the necessary revenue. Reluctantly, the board asked Sidney to redraw his plan for the area, newly designated as Section K. Even after revision, the scheme was grand: Sidney's 1867 drawing showed many lots exceeding 1000 square feet, a scale matched only in Center Circle. Moreover, each lot was self-contained. Catering to individualistic tastes, the architect used an elaborate circulation system to keep all burial plots separate. Some paths ran in straight lines, others curved gently, and still others formed rond-points along a central axis.[353]

By 1868, the board was getting desperate. Despite Sidney's revisions, lot sales could not commence until "improvements" had progressed, yet the persistent shortage of capital made such work impossible. The predicament resembled those of the cemetery's early years and a solution from that era beckoned. For several weeks, the

---

[350] Managers Minutes, 5 September 1865.
[351] See *Philadelphia Architects and Buildings Project* (online) and *Pioneers of American Landscape Design* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2000), s.v. "Sidney, James Charles."
[352] The report is transcribed in the Managers Minutes, 5 June 1866.
[353] On Section K's early design evolution, see Managers Minutes, 5 June, 3 July, 2 October (first lithograph approved), 4 December 1866, 2 April, 4 June (second lithograph approved), 1 October 1867. Modern copies of the 1867 lithograph are available at the cemetery.

managers considered selling all of Section K to William Moore – a strategy that, no matter what its drawbacks, seemed sure to promote development. The idea sank only to resurface in downscaled form. First, managers authorized the Executive Committee to make "special contracts" for discount lot sales in the section, resolving to apply the proceeds to improvements. Then Moore became the beneficiary of this arrangement, securing $5,000-worth of ground at forty-five cents per square foot.[354] The proceeds served their purpose. In the early 1870s, work edged forward on Section K, while new sections L and M made it onto the drawing boards.

The two latter sections do not appear to have been those Sidney envisioned. Section L grew out of yet another gift to a military officer, Admiral Charles Stewart. William Moore initially suggested donating ground in Section K but a committee of managers chose a large lot on the south side of Elm Avenue after hearing from George W. Childs.[355] The problem with this spot was that it fell outside existing surveys. In order to supply the necessary coordinates, managers asked Francis Lightfoot to lay out a new section in the southwest end of the cemetery. Prepared in 1873, the plan had several interesting facets. A graceful road named Union Avenue defined its outer border, honoring dead soldiers in an adjacent section. At the same time, the scheme effectively erased South Circle, further eroding Philip Price's original design.[356]

Section M came into existence under similar circumstances. As early as 1871, managers contemplated applying the name to an area between Cypress and Schuylkill Avenues. Work there staggered forward over the next six years without decisive results. Then, in 1878, railroad magnate Thomas A. Scott purchased an enormous lot on Oak Avenue. Hastily laid out to accommodate him, the surrounding ground became Section M while the incomplete section to the south was subsequently renamed N. These additions marked the end of the cemetery's internal growth.[357]

Developed after the Civil War, sections K and L were testing grounds for a new aesthetic. The first sign of change came in 1869 when the managers banned iron lot enclosures in K. Only granite curbstones would do, and their height was limited to twenty inches above ground level. Similar provisions soon followed for L. Here, however, stone corner posts were permitted so long as they were substantial and supported a single metal bar.[358] Maintenance was part of the explanation. In the early 1860s, the board had established an innovative "Lot Improvement Trust" which applied funds invested by lot owners to the upkeep of their property.[359] Saddled with this responsibility, the cemetery paid new attention to the life span of materials. But

---

[354] Managers Minutes, 5, 12 May 1868, 4 May 1869, 1 February 1870.
[355] Managers Minutes, 5 April, 3 May 1870. The author of "The Cemeteries of Philadelphia. – Woodlands Cemetery" claimed George W. Childs and Charles Macalester had chosen Stewart's lot.
[356] Managers Minutes, 4 October 1870, 2 September (lithograph), 4 November 1873. In fact, South Circle had been fading away gradually, most notably with the establishment of a large crescent-shaped lot south of the Drexel mausoleum (Managers Minutes, 6 November, 4 December 1866, 5 January, 12 March 1867).
[357] Managers Minutes, 1 August, 5 September 1871, 1 April, 6 May 1873, 5 February 1877, 5 February, 7 May, 2 July 1878,
[358] Managers Minutes, 4 May, 1 June 1869, 3 January 1871, 7 October 1873, 2 November 1875.
[359] Managers Minutes, 3 March 1863. On the rise of lot-care funds, see Sloane, 71-72, 105, 109.

the company's rules also acknowledged a broad shift in taste. In his annual report for 1871, Eli K. Price noted the arrival of granite and marble monuments in roughly equal numbers; Admiral Stewart's "massive monument of Richmond granite" still deserved special mention. Thereafter, granite became dominant and "massive" became the norm. The eclectic landscape of cast iron, marble, and brownstone was giving way to the harder, heavier, and more durable landscape of the Gilded Age.[360]

A parallel shift occurred in planting. Lot holder's tree-removal requests rose sharply in the 1860s, prompting the first recorded refusals from the board.[361] Again, there were non-aesthetic causes. (The increasing number of monuments made some tree loss inevitable). And again, these do not fully explain the change. Rather, the driving force was a reaction to the dense foliage and picturesque busyness of previous years – a reaction compatible with the "landscape lawn" influence then sweeping American cemetery design.[362] Woodlands managers participated in the trend. Their tightening control over lot treatment was especially symptomatic. Still, it is important to distinguish the penchant for "massive" construction from the more radical simplification that succeeded it. Not until the mid 1880s did a manager suggest abandoning lot enclosures to reveal "the unbroken green surface of the grass."[363]

The postwar period also brought more mundane changes. Some, such as the huge drain-building campaign that commenced in 1868, were crucial to the cemetery's short-term development. Others, such as the push for "a more permanent enclosure" around the grounds, would gain momentum later on.[364] Above all, it was time of adjusted expectations. Growth took modest forms: a new nursery in the northeast corner, land for a quarry to the southwest.[365] When plans materialized for a more ambitious purchase – up to four acres along the western border – they foundered on objections that "there is so much unoccupied ground within the present limits."[366]

Gilded Age Adjustments: 1875 – 1900

Lot sales gradually slipped downward. There were 362 interments in 1870 but only 285 four years later.[367] While these numbers were not catastrophic, they worried the managers and reinforced their reluctance to undertake major projects. At the same time, the company found itself needing to reassure the public that city streets would

---

[360] EKP, Reports from Managers to Corporators for the Years 1871 (n.d.), 1872 (4 January 1873), 1873 ([n.d.] January 1874), WCCC.
[361] Of the many references to tree removal, see for example Managers Minutes, 3, 12 December 1861, 1 December 1868.
[362] Sloane, 97-112, 121-124.
[363] J. Sergeant Price, Report from Managers to Corporators for the Year 1886, n.d., WCCC.
[364] On drains, see Managers Minutes, 7 July, 1 September, 1 December 1868, and especially Corporators Minutes, 1 January 1870. On the first push for a new fence, see Manager Minutes, 2 July 1867.
[365] Managers Minutes, 5 June 1866, 5 March, 2 April, 7 May 1867.
[366] Managers Minutes, 1 April 1873. See also Managers Minutes 3 October 1871, 4 March 1873; Corporators Minutes, 4 January 1873, 12 January 1874.
[367] EKP, Reports from Managers to Corporators for the Years 1870 ([n.d.] January 1871), and 1874 (n.d.), WCCC.

not be laid through the grounds.[368] Monument Cemetery had recently suffered this fate and stood about the same distance from downtown as The Woodlands. Potential lot-buyers were understandably wary. By the end of the decade, business prospects were grim. The Executive Committee warned fellow managers: "the Company is using principal [to cover] running expenses and…the receipts from graves and collections are insufficient to meet the outlay for labor and salaries."[369] Major cost-cutting measures seemed to offer the only way out.

The 1880s, however, witnessed a turnaround. Several factors were involved, including administrative reforms and changes in the national economy. Just as important was the West Chester and Philadelphia Railroad's decision to erect a station near the cemetery's southwest corner. This move and the extension of 42nd Street to the tracks inspired Woodlands managers to launch their largest building campaign in almost twenty years. As the annual report for 1886 announced,

> The Managers propose during the coming Spring to further improve the ground bordering on the railroad and construct a substantial iron enclosure with entrance gate on the side next the new station. They have constructed a stone walk connecting with the temporary board walk and when 42nd Street is opened for use, will construct a carriage road from the mansion to the station. The stone wall on Woodlands Avenue between the Main Entrance and the West gate near 41st Street…has been removed, and a substantial wrought iron Fence, erected in its stead…The main avenue from the entrance has been well laid with slag from iron furnaces, for a distance of about 1200 feet inside the entrance and carefully rolled, and as soon as Spring opens this material will be continued on the principal roads and some of the walks.[370]

Plans to replace the cemetery's aging wall with some sort iron enclosure had stalled long ago.[371] Now they leapt forward, giving the grounds an airier, less fortified appearance that wooed passersby. Newly "macadamized" roads were another incentive to visitors. Offering smooth passage for carriages, they also complemented the undulating lawns that management had come to prize. Even the mansion was upgraded. The company's office moved to a corner facing the train station and, as part of the same reorientation, stairs were added to the portico.[372]

The jump in burials was another sign of prosperity: annual interments exceeded 400 in 1887.[373] Continuing a trend that originated in the previous decade, great industrialists were drawn to The Woodlands, joining doctors and military officers as

---

[368] Benjamin P. Wilson, *Woodlands Cemetery* (1873 pamphlet), WCCC.
[369] Managers Minutes, 4 March 1879.
[370] J. Sergeant Price, Report for 1886.
[371] Managers Minutes, 2 July, 6 August 1867, 6 April 1869, 4 April 1871, 7 May 1872, 6 May 1873, 3 March 1874.
[372] [J. Sergeant Price], Report for 1887.
[373] Ibid.

the institution's principal ornaments. Their lots were compounds, setting new standards in heft and permanence. Occasionally, aesthetic unity was the goal. Railroad president J. Edgar Thomson's plot was ringed by sweeping expanses of granite and featured a French-influenced sarcophagus with boldly concave sides (K-8). More often, though, enclosures preceded and upstaged their monuments – witness the example of Thomas Scott (M 3). Outside Center Circle, where many lots had already been sold, the glories of Gilded Age wealth were best represented in Sections L and M. The former hosted a dour mausoleum for the McDaniel family; built in 1887, it recalled earlier banks by architect Frank Furness.[374] A Gothic canopy for the Readings and a column for the Allisons arose nearby, crested by angels and vying for attention. It was in M however, that staggering displays occurred. Set in a plaza with benches, dentist Thomas Evans' obelisk dominated the surrounding landscape on an imperial scale (M-6). Relatives of steamship mogul Jacob Neafie signalized their own fortune's source by means of a nautical screw. To the north, a row of hillside vaults developed along Valley Avenue, forming the only such group in the cemetery.

If any part of the grounds fell out of step with the reigning taste, it was the Soldiers Section. There was no great central monument, no substantial enclosure. During the 1870s, cemetery managers continued to lobby the government for these amenities, at one point hoping to surround the lot with defunct cannon. Such possibilities dissolved in 1885. Instead of sponsoring construction, the Army agreed to remove all 115 bodies. The cemetery supplied the necessary labor.[375]

Combined with stricter rules on lot treatment, the fate of the Soldiers Section suggests increasingly assertive managerial stance toward the cemetery's appearance and operation. A related clampdown occurred in 1888 when manager Benjamin P. Wilson formally interrogated members of the cemetery's staff.[376] The interviews seem to have followed incidents in which monument suppliers and would-be lot speculators received aid from company employees. Had compensation changed hands? If so, how much? Other questions involved the role of outside gardeners, some of whom lived near the cemetery and were cutting into its business. Again, Wilson suspected staff collusion. Whatever the upshot of these proceedings, their historical interest stems from their context rather than their details. It is clear, for instance, that by the late 1880s, Woodlands Cemetery had spawned jobs and businesses in the surrounding neighborhood. When Wilson spoke of a wily monument dealer, he may well have been referring to John M. Gessler, whose "Plain and Ornamental Granite and Marble Works" stood at 39th and Baltimore.[377] Equally important is the general gist of Wilson's questions. Taken together, they show an

---

[374] Ibid. No known documentary evidence links Furness to the building.
[375] Managers Minutes, 4 October 1870, 6 October 1874; Benjamin P. Wilson to Major W. B. Hughes, 10 April 1885, and related correspondence of that month, WCCC.
[376] At least three interviews occurred. The first two were between Wilson and an employee identified only as Hoffman; they occurred on 28 May and 11 June 1888. On November 10, 1888, Wilson questioned William B. Walker, then apparently the cemetery's gardener and later its superintendent. Notes on the proceedings survive in the WCCC.
[377] Contemporary bills from Gessler are located in the WCCC.

inclination to bring all lot gardening, construction, and maintenance under company control – a broad trend in contemporary cemetery management.[378]

Lot holders' personal involvement in the care of their plots diminished in the last third of the nineteenth century. Lot gardening and maintenance fell increasingly to the cemetery and became billable services – a symptom of Americans' broadening distance from the treatment and disposition of the dead. This did not mean, however, that lot owners ceased to visit graves or care about their appearance. Alleging that cemetery staff took flowers from existing graves to decorate new ones, lot owner Samuel Speck sued the company and published outraged pamphlets.[379]

Aside from this controversy, the 1890s were fairly uneventful at The Woodlands. Efforts continued to resurface the avenues with slag; brick was now favored for paths. In keeping with earlier landscape-lawn directives, the company enacted a complete ban on lot enclosures and launched "a crusade to secure the removal of those already constructed."[380] More wall came down along Woodland Avenue and was replaced by iron fencing.[381] Perhaps the greatest shift involved the form and function of Section K. For all the commercial hopes once attached to the area, lots there sold slowly. The managers thus revised Sidney's plan once again, simplifying the paths and scaling back the whole. Arcs and circles began giving way to a basic grid.[382]

The Twentieth Century

Woodlands Cemetery never went the way of Monument Cemetery. An invasion by city streets, feared into the 1880s, never came to pass – not, at least, on the scale foreseen at that time. What transpired instead was a slower transformation, spread out over a century but profound in its cumulative effect. Continued urban growth brought the cemetery closer to the city's geographic center. New roads and buildings encroached from the outside while harsh maintenance policies and the natural lifecycle of trees wrought changes from within. But loss and decline were not the only patterns. As the cemetery lost ground, managers artfully concealed the effects with landscaping. As lot-buyer and neighborhood demographics changed, managers grew more accepting of social diversity. Some patterns have even come full circle. Recreation has re-emerged as one of the landscape's main attractions as has historical tourism. Joggers, cyclists, and genealogists now cross tracks in good weather.

At first glance, industrialization of the cemetery's environs looks like a twentieth-century legacy. Visitors gazing out on the Schuylkill see tank farms and factories, not the shoreline of distant New Jersey. In a sense, though, the origins of this landscape are older than the cemetery itself. William Hamilton struggled to obscure the

---

[378] Sloane, 104-113.
[379] Ibid., 109-120. Documents relating to the Speck case are on file in the WCCC.
[380] J. Sergeant Price, Annual Report for 1896, n.d., WCCC.
[381] See 1894 bids from Albanus L. Smith & Co., Ornamental Iron Work and M. & J. B. McHugh, General Contractors, WCCC.
[382] "Section K Woodlands Cemetery Revised October 9 1897," scale 1" = 50'; ink on linen, WCCC.

development for which Mill Creek was named. Thomas Mitchell's canal plan failed, but his coal wharves went in and railroads laced the Schuylkill soon afterward. By 1856, passengers could find descriptions of the Philadelphia Gas Works and eulogies to the nearby Gray's Garden – victim of "the utilitarianism of the age" – in a single guidebook.[383] Joshua Francis Fisher opined:

> The city out-skirts have encroached everywhere now. Ugly buildings rise where meadows and groves bounded the quiet river. The trees around the margin, which shaded the romantic walks I enjoyed so much as a boy, have been cut down for wharves and a railway. The fine woods of Gray's Gardens, the more distinct plantations of the Bartrams, the picturesque projecting rocks in the foreground, over all which we used to look while we traced the meanders of the tranquil Schuylkill on its way to the Delaware, all are gone! and the primitive floating bridge has given place to the great tasteless wooden viaduct of the Baltimore Railroad, which spoils the landscape and obstructs the view.[384]

By the 1880s, Mill Creek itself ran underground. What the twentieth century brought, then, was not a new pattern but more of the same. And along with it came more sustained critiques. City beautifier John F. Lewis used photographs and historical research to show the Lower Schuylkill's past splendor and future promise.[385]

No single institution determined the cemetery's shape or surroundings in the last century. Among the competing influences, the University of Pennsylvania has probably been the greatest. As early as the 1880s, Dr. Joseph Rothrock, who (thanks to Eli K. Price) held the University's Chair of Botany, commenced work a botanic garden abutting the cemetery's northeast corner.[386] Rothrock's successor pushed this project forward, creating ponds linked by a bog garden and an array of related features. By the 1910s, the wild ravine that defined the eastern side of the cemetery was serving informally, even discreetly as a "large open air amphitheater" in which plays "advertised as being given in the Botanic Garden" were staged.[387] Meanwhile, more lasting changes were underway. The University bought land on the other side

---

[383] Charles P. Dare, *Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore Railroad Guide: Containing a Description of the Scenery, Rivers, Towns, Villages, and Objects of Interest Along the Line of Road; Including Historical Sketches, Legends, &c.* (Philadelphia: Fitzgibbon & Van Ness, 1856), 112, 118.

[384] Joshua Francis Fisher, *Recollections*, 218-219.

[385] John Frederick Lewis, *The Redemption of the Lower Schuylkill: the River as It Was, The River as It Is, The River as It Should Be* (Philadelphia: City Parks Association, 1924) – for passages and photographs of special relevance to Woodlands Cemetery, see pp. 6-7, 63, 69, 96, 119, 134-135.

[386] See Timothy P. Long, "The University Botanic Garden," TMs (1991), 8; Edward Potts Cheyney, *History of the University of Pennsylvania, 1740-1940* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1940), 430; Harshberger, *Botanists of Philadelphia*, 17.

[387] George E. Nitzche, "Dr. John M. Macfarlane, the Friend," an address before the Botanical Society of Pennsylvania, 5 February 1944, as quoted in Long, "University Botanic Garden," 17. On Macfarlane's contributions to the Botanic Garden, see also John T. Faris, *Old Gardens in and about Philadelphia and Those Who Made Them* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1932), 174-178.

of Woodland Avenue in 1901 and built the new Veterinary School there.[388] Fraternities moved in nearby, and further university expansion loomed. To guide this growth, President Edgar Fahs Smith sought advice from architect-cum-design professor Paul Cret and Dean Warren Laird.

The Cret Plan of 1913 was a study in Beaux-Arts monumentality. Principal streets passing through the campus appeared as grand boulevards converging on a traffic circle. A central axis extending north from College Hall would form the university's new center of gravity.[389] When it came to Woodlands Cemetery, Cret and Laird saw gentle curves. Instead of the rigid Cleveland Avenue long envisioned by the City along the cemetery's eastern border, the design team proposed a road that swung slightly to the west. The resulting benefits were clear. The reoriented route would align with 39th Street, brining "six lines of departure" together at a single intersection; the cemetery would lose only a small amount of land, already cut off by the ravine; the university could graft some of this ground onto the botanic garden parcel, creating space for new dormitories. Such a scheme required adjustments on the cemetery's part. The largest would be moving John McArthur's gate. Even here, though, the designers found a silver lining: "The monumental entrance…would be given a fine setting on the axis of Thirty-ninth Street, opposite the center of the plaza…, and one more convenient than the present because nearer the center of the cemetery."[390]

As it happened, University growth moved more slowly over the next decade than it had in the previous one. This left the Cret Plan largely unrealized. But if Cret's and Laird's broad vision foundered, their suggestions for Cleveland Avenue lingered on, gradually seeping into City planning doctrine and influencing the course of the real thoroughfare that took Cleveland Avenue's place. That route was University Avenue. Conceived in stages, it crossed the Schuylkill on a bridge designed by Paul Cret and Stephen B. Noyes in 1925, then edged north under a 1930 municipal ordinance.[391] Three years later, the City claimed four acres on the cemetery's eastern side, making way for the next extension. Work lagged behind tenure, and it was not until early 1936 that the full implications of the taking became clear. On March 8th, the *Philadelphia Inquirer* announced in large type: "Woodlands Gate-House to Vanish."[392]

---

[388] Deed, Eli K. Price, Jr., to Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania, 1 June 1901, WCCC; see also related correspondence between Price and University Provost Charles C. Harrison, WCCC.

[389] George E. Thomas and David Brownlee, *Building America's First University: An Historical and Architectural Guide to the University of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), 97-98.

[390] Paul Phillipe Cret, Warren Powers Laird, Olmsted Brothers, *Report to the Board of Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania Upon the Future Development of Buildings and grounds and Conservation of Surrounding Territory* (1913), 18-19 and map 1.

[391] *Philadelphia Architects and Buildings Project* (online), s.v. "Cret, Paul Phillipe;" *Plan of University Avenue from the Schuylkill River to Vintage Avenue and Vintage Avenue from University Avenue to 34th Street, 27th Ward, City of Philadelphia, Prepared for the Use of the Board of View in the Matter of the Opening Thereof Under Ordinances Approved Jan. 22 1930 and March 19 1931, George F. Shegog, Regulator and Surveyor, 11 District, Nov. 19 1935*, WCCC; untitled, undated plan of land taken by the City for the bed of University Avenue, WCCC.

[392] "New Avenue Dooms Cemetery Portal," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, 8 March 1936.

Within days, local preservationists started to mobilize. Drawn from the ranks of Philadelphia high society, they used their posts in array of civic organizations to protest the City's plan. Miss Frances Anne Wister led the charge. As President of the Philadelphia Society for the Preservation of Landmarks she contacted the Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence; as a Vice-President of the Civic Club she was likely in touch with the City Parks Association. These groups' letters to the Cemetery touched on similar themes: the entrance was "a well known landmark;" its forty-foot columns were "solid" – each carved from a single block of stone.[393] If demolition was inevitable, couldn't the columns themselves be saved? Company Secretary Philip Price responded patiently, stressing the Cemetery's limited funds and lack of influence. Moreover, as several newspapers noted, the Democratic National Convention was approaching; if University Avenue reached completion in June as the City intended, it would facilitate access to nearby Convention Hall. By mid May, the battle was over. Trucks pulled down McArthur's soot-blackened arch at 5 a.m. on the 23rd, sparing no architectural elements. Road construction, already underway, proceeded rapidly. The result was a smooth concrete curve, sixty feet wide and almost 2000 feet long, with dense foliage to either side.[394]

Paul Cret must have followed the denouement closely. Since March, he had been working on plans for a new entrance at the company's behest, but his relationship to the project was multifold.[395] As author of the 1913 University master plan, he watched one of his proposals come to fruition. A Manager of the City Parks Association, he also lived near the cemetery on Woodland Terrace. These overlapping interests, along with a climate of public concern, begin to explain the considerable effort his firm devoted to a relatively small commission. By May 1st, the office had generated seven distinct proposals and numerous lesser variations. Designs ranged from florid Baroque to stark, classicizing Modern; two of the most original called for reuse of McArthur's columns. In the end, though, conservatism and new materials won out. The Cemetery settled on simple limestone lodges whose fronts stepped forward as rusticated pilasters framing metal doors. Pedestrians familiar with McArthur's iron gate would have seen its central winged-hourglass motif in reappear Cret's replacement.[396]

---

[393] Frances Wister to WCC, 27 March 1936. This and other pleas are filed together in WCCC.

[394] Road construction and events leading to the gatehouse's demise are chronicled in "Convention Hall to Get New Road," *Philadelphia Record*, 25 March 1936; "City's Newest Street By-passing Traffic to Convention Hall Has Its Obstacles," Philadelphia *Evening Ledger*, 30 April 1936; "University Avenue Extension through Woodlands Cemetery to be Completed for Democratic Convention," Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin*, 13 May 1936; "Woodlands Gate Pillars Removed," Philadelphia *Evening Bulleting*, 23 May 1936; "University Avenue Extension through Woodlands Cemetery Nears Completion," Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin*, 2 June 1936. These articles are gathered in a clippings file, WCCC.

[395] It is unclear when Cret received the gate commission. The earliest dated drawing produced by his firm, a "Plan Showing Relocation of Drive and Proposed Curbs at Entrance," is from 20 March 1936 (Paul Philippe Cret Coll., Athenaeum of Philadelphia). By April, the Company was mentioning the project to preservationists (Philip Price to Alice G. Fox, 21 April 1936, WCCC), and in June Cret submitted his first bill (Cret to WCC, 15 June 1936, WCCC).

[396] Cret's design proposals and construction drawings (Work No. 315) are located in the Paul Philippe Cret Coll., Athenaeum of Philadelphia. Presentation drawing SK–6A, "Gates for Woodlands Cemetery," 16 April 1936, closely approximates the final design but uses lions' heads instead of hourglasses.

Work proceeded at a steady pace. Steele Building Construction Company received the contract in June, letting Cret's office prepare the agreement and serve as intermediary. The estimated construction cost came to $12,847 – roughly half of the previous gate's price without counting for inflation. By February of the following year the project was complete. It included a new driveway and sidewalk (also handled by Steele), as well as two arc-shaped beds of evergreen shrubs, designed to fit Cret's exedra.[397]

For all its apparent mass, the new gate did not stay put for long. World War II left the U.S. Government searching for land on which to locate new Veterans Administration hospitals, and in early 1947 the eastern quarter of Woodlands Cemetery yielded one such site. At first the condemned parcel's boundaries excluded Cret's entrance. However, more investigation by the War Department's Corps of Engineers led them to conclude that all land up to the line of burial was fair game. The resulting seizure claimed nearly fifteen acres of cemetery property. Included were large parts of Section M and almost all that remained of the valley after the City's taking. As the War Department leveled the site and prepared for construction, Cret's successors, Harbeson Hough Livingston & Larson, drew up plans for moving their deceased principal's work. Now the cemetery opened onto a triangular area at the foot of 40th Street where westbound trolleys emerged from the ground.[398]

While these changes dramatically altered the cemetery landscape, they concentrated on terrain the company had long considered marginal. Indeed, so little had come of the mausoleum-lined oasis once envisioned by J. C. Sidney that in 1939 the City asserted it had done the cemetery a favor by running University Avenue through "hitherto useless and virtually valueless" parts of the grounds.[399] No such argument accompanied the next taking, in 1955. This time, the land in question was a narrow strip along the southern border, needed as sewer line right-of-way.[400] Suing for damages, the cemetery also complied with City demands, removing bodies from Sections N and L. It was the company's first encounter with forced exhumation.

---

[397] On the principal contract, see "Philadelphia Contracts Awarded," *Philadelphia Real Estate Record and Builders' Guide*, 51, no. 20 (10 June 1936): 77; Agreement between Steele Building Construction Company and WCC, 11 June 1936, filed with project-related bills, correspondence, and account sheets, WCCC. The final construction cost was $13,256, on which Cret charged a 10% fee. On the landscape contract, see J. Franklin Meehan, Jr. to WCC, 16 October 1936, and accompanying plan, WCCC.

[398] *Veterans Administration Hospital, Philadelphia, PA, 1000 Bed G. M. Property Map, War Department Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District, for V.A. Project No. 2871, approved 1 Jan 1947 and modified 6 October 1947,* brownline, WCCC; three drawings for Work No. 315A, 15 October 1948 with revision of 3 December 1948, Harbeson Hough Livingston & Larson, Cret Coll., Athenaeum of Philadelphia.

[399] "Penn and Cemetery Given $197,000 for 'Trespass' by City," *Philadelphia Record*, 30 June 1939.

[400] *Plan Made for the Use of the Board of Viewers Showing the Property of the Woodlands Cemetery Co. 27th Ward Philadelphia in the Matter of the Construction, Improvement, Extension and Equipment of the Southwest Sewage Treatment Works Authorized by Ordinance of Council Approved August 14, 1946*, Dayton F. Stout, Surveyor and Regulator 7th District, 19 May 1955; various scales, WCCC. Annotations shows the Cemetery was notified of the taking on 15 February 1955.

Three major property losses in as many decades left Woodlands Cemetery with rough edges. Starting in 1957, managers set out to restore, even to enhance, the sense of enclosure that had attended their institution since its founding. Landscape architects Wheelwright, Stevenson & Langran supplied plans for the work. Early phases built up the southern and eastern borders with privet hedges and screens of deciduous trees. (Specifications emphasized Dorthea Crabapples, Flowering Dogwoods, Norway Maples, and White Ashes but a recent study shows other species were often chosen). Arriving in 1965, the final Wheelwright plan shifted attention to the western border. Here, the firm suggested, clumps of magnolias, hawthorns cherry trees could be used to obscure an aging truck factory.[401]

But even as the cemetery regained some of its former isolation, it lost much of the density and intimacy bestowed by nineteenth-century lot treatments. The campaign against "clutter" was not new. Its first forays had come in the landscape-lawn era, when managers set strict height limits on new enclosures and started to remove old ones. Since then, there had been periodic sweeps. It was under the reign of Superintendent George C. Scholl, however, that true zealotry set in. His maintenance reports of the 1960s outline what can only be described as a wholesale stripping of the landscape. In the period between April 1, 1961 and March 31, 1962, for instance, Scholl recorded removing "30 copings and post and rail enclosures…239 marble foot stones and cradles broken or cracked beyond repair…15 ivy borders from uncared for lots…201 ivy blankets from uncared for lots," and "30 corner markers from [the] General Interment Section."[402] Like so many rural cemeteries, Woodlands had watched its lot-care funds dwindle in recent years.[403] The two accounts created for this purpose were hardly adequate, making "uncared for lots" seem an intolerable burden. Nonetheless, the effects of Scholl's drive were irreversible and have since become a source of managerial regret.

Other changes to the landscape at mid century were less drastic. Walks throughout the grounds were paved in brick. Much filling occurred near the 42nd Street gate, a chain-link fence went up nearby, and the "open ditch" southwest of the stable became a culvert.[404] Monument designs were changing, too. Long since subject to increasing standardization, they now were flush with the ground in some areas – a concession to power mowing and to the budgets of less affluent lot-buyers.

Flush markers were not necessarily tied to low income. However, as middle-class whites migrated to Philadelphia's suburbs after World War II, the cemetery found itself surrounded by poorer and more racially mixed neighborhoods whose residents

---

[401] Two blueprint plans by Wheelwright, Stevenson & Langran entitled "Woodlands Cemetery" (Dwg. No. 480-1), 24 May 1957 with revisions on 15 April 1963, 12 Dec 1963, 10 May 1965, filed with related correspondence, WCCC. These documents are proposals, implemented selectively. For the result, see A. William Graham, "Tree Inventory and Care Needs Assessment for the Woodlands Cemetery," Appendix II in Olin Partnership, "The Woodlands: Preliminary Landscape Master Plan," (2001).

[402] George C. Scholl to Eli K. Price, III, 31 March 1962, filed with other superintendent's reports, WCCC [*currently in possession of Tim Long*]. I am grateful to Timothy Long for pointing out this material.

[403] Sloane, 204-206.

[404] George C. Scholl to Eli K. Price, III, 10 April 1961, 31 March 1962.

sometimes wished to buy lots. Racial diversity had never been a hallmark of the institution. Unwritten policy had long prohibited burial of blacks, and when Asians were admitted in the 1950s it was on the condition that "they are Christians and they are buried with Occidental rites, and furthermore that no Japanese or Chinese characters may be engraven on any stones which they might care to erect at the site of the graves."[405] By the 1970s, all this was changing. Out of economic necessity, the company established new blocks of single graves in Sections K, N, and H, and opened them to anyone who could afford the price. It was a profound change of direction, at once an admission of failure and an acceptance of overdue reform.[406]

As the cemetery company adjusted to surrounding social realities, it also grew more history conscious. Urban renewal helped make Philadelphia a hotbed for the nation's historic preservation movement, and in 1968, just two years after the passage of federal preservation laws, The Woodlands mansion became a National Historic Landmark. Visitors arrived, eager to glimpse hidden grandeur. Advertising one such event, the University City Historical Society announced, "This is a rare opportunity for the public to see the architectural splendor and horticultural delights of one of America's great Colonial estates."[407] But, while the house's merits were indisputable, what remained of Hamilton's "horticultural delights"?

For over a century, botanists, historians and memoirists had reeled off lists of living relics thought to survive from the Hamilton era. In 1879, Townsend Ward noted "numerous specimens of the Magnolia" and two large ginkgoes; (the latter were of special interest because Hamilton had introduced the species to America).[408] Next to the ginkgoes, the main attractions were "four plants of the Caucasian *Zelkova crenata*," distinguished by their enormous trunks.[409] And maybe there were other survivors. Benjamin H. Smith believed "a few ancient English hawthorns" fit the profile.[410] In any case, modern visitors who came in search of "Colonial" horticulture were probably disappointed. Most massive trees on the grounds were planted by the cemetery company, and while these deserve attention in their own right, they do not form a tidy counterpart to the mansion's architecture.

Moreover, surprisingly little thought has gone into preserving specimens that *may* predate the cemetery. In the mid-1980s, company staff cut down two great ginkgoes – presumably those Ward saw. As landscape historian Karen Madsen observed soon

---

[405] Eli K. Price, III, to Superintendent Richmond Thompson, 2 July 1952, WCCC. Cemetery managers planned to restrict lot sales to whites from the start (see "Plan of Conveyancing &c. in respect to the Woodlands," and Corporators Minutes, 13 July 1840). However, unlike nearby Laurel Hill, Woodlands avoided putting this rule into print and was prepared to make exceptions for such illustrious figures as exiled Japanese statesman Tatsui Baba (1850-1888).

[406] Author's interview with WCC Archivist Earl Hood, 9 July 2003; current cemetery section maps.

[407] "An Afternoon at the Woodlands," University City Historical Society flyer, 8 June 1968, WCCC.

[408] Ward, 163. The earliest such recitation may be Andrew Jackson Downing, *A Treatise on the Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening, Adapted to North America; with a View to the Improvement of Country Residences* (New York: George P. Putnam, 1850), 42. On the ginkgoes, see also Faris, 156.

[409] Harshberger, *Botanists of Philadelphia*, 435; see also pp. 113-114, 434.

[410] Smith, 71.

afterward, "This regrettable incident has settled the long-running debate about which is the oldest ginkgo in the United States: there is no doubt that it is the male specimen in Bartram's Garden…."[411] Yet there may still be hope for the relic hunters. A recent Morris Arboretum survey identified over a dozen trees whose size qualified them as possible Pennsylvania State Champions. Intriguingly, two were aging zelkovas.[412]

Today, Woodlands Cemetery is itself a source of historical interest. Long viewed as an intrusion on Hamilton's estate or as a study in Victorian eccentricity, the commemorative landscape is starting to be understood as a piece of material culture, imbued with complex social and aesthetic meanings. This change of perspective will likely keep the grounds safe from redevelopment, contemplated periodically by the University of Pennsylvania.[413] School children research the biographies of the interred, preservationists sit on the Board, and gentrification of the surrounding neighborhood has gained the cemetery a broad constituency of enthusiasts. Whether burial will persist as the institution's primary function remains an open question.

C. Historical Narrative

William Hamilton and the Public Nature of the Woodlands

Enduring interest in The Woodlands has much to do with the site's dense historical layering – the way it seems to encapsulate multiple phases of a compelling American story. That story is the march of democracy. As Karen Madsen has claimed, "the Woodlands is nothing less than a crucial way station on the road that led from English country seat to American country seat to rural cemetery to the great public parks of the nineteenth century – parks that a century later remain the quintessential American idea of a public park."[414] This proposition, which might be labeled the way-station thesis, has been elaborated elsewhere and has become central to the interpretation of rural cemeteries generally.[415] It is appealing both for its coherence and because it draws testimony from such prominent nineteenth-century observers as Andrew Jackson Downing. There are, however, other frameworks in which the history of The Woodlands might be understood. For while Hamilton's estate has always been partially public, it has also remained stubbornly and intriguingly private.

Historians once felt comfortable likening New World botanists to their Old World counterparts. Thus, "As the Rev. Henry Muhlenberg is called the 'American Linnaeus,' Dr. David Hosack has been named the 'Sir Joseph Banks of America,' so influential were Hosack's contacts, his friendships, and his accomplishments."[416] Cautiously extending this outmoded convention to William Hamilton, modern

---

[411] Madsen, 23.
[412] Graham, 29.
[413] This goal was formalized in "University of Pennsylvania, Campus Development Plan," 3rd ed. (1966), pp. 18-19, and has since cropped up periodically in discussions with the Cemetery.
[414] Madsen, 23.
[415] David Schuyler, *The New Urban Landscape: The Redefinition of City Form in Nineteenth-Century America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), 54-56.
[416] Joseph Ewan, "Frederick Pursh," 612.

scholars might consider him the Lord Petre of the Early Republic. Robert James Petre, eighth Baron Petre (1713–1742), was revered by contemporaries for having amassed an extraordinary collection of plants at Thorndon Hall, his estate in Essex, England. During the 1730s, Petre stood at the forefront of a burgeoning interest in American exotics; Peter Collinson, whose collaboration with John Bartram did much to fuel this movement, informed Bartram in 1741, "Last year Ld petre planted out about Tenn thousand Americans wch being att the Same Time mixed wth about Twenty Thousand Europeans, & some Asians make a very beautifull appearance."[417] Petre maintained an immense greenhouse complex but was as concerned with garden design as he was with botany. Recent scholarship has focused on his sophisticated use of contrasting greens and his graduated arrangement of flowering shrubs in borders. The latter, at least, was a technique William Hamilton understood.

Tantalizing evidence suggests still closer connections. Daniel Defoe sounds like Charles Drayton when describing Petre's kitchen garden: "This is situated behind the Offices, so that it doth not appear in sight from the House, and is detached from the other Gardens; and thereby is not exposed to Strangers, who would have Admittance to walk thro' the Pleasure Garden and Plantations."[418] And if such visual tricks appeared on other estates, it is harder to ignore the resemblance between Petre's and Hamilton's houses despite radical differences in scale.

In reality, of course, William Hamilton was no Lord Petre. If Hamilton cherished notions of membership in an American nobility (and there is reason to believe he did), vast social, economic, and political differences separated him from the estate owners he revered. Nevertheless, considering Britain's landed plantsmen as Hamilton's likely models helps bring his social role into focus. Because Hamilton associated with eminent naturalists of his day, he is easily lumped in with a "circle" that included Humphry Marshall, William Bartram, Benjamin Smith Barton and Frederick Pursh.[419] To varying degrees, these men were Hamilton's peers, but each occupied a distinct place in Philadelphia's botanical community and none would have confused his position with Hamilton's. Wealth and leisure set him apart. His energies went not to exploration and only briefly to description or illustration. Acquisition and display were his primary interests, and while these impulses stemmed from a profound interest in plants, they played out in a cosmopolitan contest for status and refinement, and must be understood in that light.[420]

Some fifty years after Hamilton's decease, the aging and acerbic Joshua Francis Fisher wrote down his youthful memories of The Woodlands. He described Hamilton's possessions at length – Dutch and Flemish paintings, "cabinets of curiosities, mosaics, etc., …two beautiful mirrors of Venetian glass" – then added:

---

[417] Peter Collinson to John Bartram, 1 September 1841, quoted in Laird, *Flowering*, 64. On Petre, see Laird, *Flowering*, 63-64, 69-74; Quest-Ritson, 157-158; Edmondson, 148-152.
[418] Daniel Defoe, *A Tour thro' the Whole Island of Great Britain* (London, 1738), v. I, pp. 124-125, as quoted in Quest-Ritson, 158.
[419] See, for instance, Madsen, 20.
[420] On the larger cultural process at work here, see Richard L. Bushman, *The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, Cities* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992), chapter 4.

> It seemed a very Strawberry Hill, and I fancied William Hamilton must be something like Horace Walpole! He had many of his tastes, certainly, but I presume none of his wit, for I never heard it hinted at. He kept a hospitable home, entertained gentlemen frequently, and ladies occasionally. He drove showy equipages, and his chariot or barouche with postillions made quite a dash through the streets of Philadelphia.[421]

Such performances stood out in an American context. Whatever Fisher's biases and temporal distance, he discerned the almost courtly ostentation of the world Hamilton sought to construct. It was a mode of self-presentation based on classical learning and refined sensibilities – dilettantism in its eighteenth-century sense.[422] Even more than Fisher, the poetess "Laura" (presumably Sarah Wister) captured the larger thrust of Hamilton's project in her 1809 ode to The Woodlands. Dense with allusions to "flow'ry treasures" and "Classic pleasures," it concluded with the couplet: "Where the bright wave of the winding Schuylkill glides, And Peace, with *Hamilton* and Taste, resides."[423]

Botany was central to this tableau. A strange hint of the pastime's importance to Hamilton's aristocratic image is suggested by the pseudo-Linnean name of his black servant, Haga Africana.[424] Other evidence comes from peers in the field. Bernard M'Mahon's well-known complaint to Jefferson – "altho' he is in every other respect a particular friend of mine, he never offered me one [plant] in return" – is arguably the obverse of Manasseh Cutler's humorous depiction of a host so bent on exhibiting his botanical books and specimens that he drives his learned guest to exhaustion.[425] M'Mahon, an Irish émigré and accomplished seedsman, was a local competitor and not someone Hamilton needed to impress. Cutler, by contrast was New England's botanical eminence; clergyman, lawyer and congressman, he was the sort of genteel polymath who constituted The Woodlands' ideal audience. Questions of Hamilton's character or ultimate motives are largely beside the point. More relevant are historian David Brigham's observations on "the fluid network of labor, capital, and personalities that sustained the study of natural history."[426]

---

[421] Joshua Francis Fisher, *Recollections*, 221-222. I have treated these passages as a single paragraph, an arrangement corresponding to that in Fisher's MS, Cadwalader Coll., Series IX, box 10, HSP.
[422] Girouard, 176; Quest-Ritson, 117-120. On Hamilton's self-image, see also Jacobs, 46-56.
[423] Laura, 181. On Laura's identity, see Kathryn Zabelle Derounian, "'A dear friend,': Six Letters from Deborah Norris to Sarah Wister, 1778-1779," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 108, no. 4 (October 1984): 492.
[424] 22 June 1820 entry in "Estate of James Hamilton Deceased" (account book) **get full citation**.
[425] Bernhard M'Mahon to Thomas Jefferson, 3 January 1809, in *Thomas Jefferson's Garden Book*, 401; "Visit of Manasseh Cutler," 110; Stetson, 30-31; McLean, 143-144.
[426] David R. Brigham, "Mark Catesby and the Patronage of Natural History in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century," in Amy R. W. Meyers and Margaret Beck Pritchard, eds., *Empire's Nature: Mark Catesby's New World Vision* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 95.

William Hamilton learned natural history as part of his education at the College of Philadelphia (later the University of Pennsylvania). By the mid 1780s, his library included some sixty-one books on botany alone, and his intellectual reach was further extended by loans from elite peers.[427] What was at stake in such exchanges, as often of plants as of books? Some sense may be gleaned from Hamilton's anxious interactions with his deceased uncle's creditor, Robert Barclay, while in England. Assigned to settle his uncle's debts (or to attempt as much), Hamilton discovered to his partial relief that Barclay was a fellow plant collector, interested in obtaining exotics. The insight prompted urgent letters to Hamilton's steward and to a friend, requesting their "immediate attention" to the task of gathering specimens for shipment.[428] Barclay by this time had expressed reservations about credit in post-Revolutionary America. Whether Hamilton's offering achieved the desired effect (presumably reassurance and good will rather than actual debt relief), the point of the gesture is clear. At a time when "collecting of exotics…conveyed symbolically the breadth of one's financial or political power," Hamilton knew there were several currencies in which he might trade.[429]

As a wealthy horticulturist in the early republic, Hamilton was deeply ambivalent about the relationship of nature and nation. The values that guided his project at The Woodlands were essentially English in both their scientific and cultural aims. To the extent that Hamilton considered himself a scientist, he was bound in a predicament that one historian has recently summarized:

> Before American independence, colonial naturalists made their most distinctive contributions to a natural history that underwrote British power and deferred to European-define theories of nature; after the American Revolution, United States naturalists struggled to overcome this colonial framework, but they failed to establish themselves in fields outside natural history, instead relying on its descriptive methods of study to argue for their nation's distinctiveness.[430]

The latter campaign held little appeal for Hamilton, who was more interested in collecting plants than in describing them. Still, the native Philadelphian had felt his American-ness keenly while abroad, and the sentiment had forced him to weigh the merits of monarchy and advanced civilization (both of which he admired) against America's "gifts from nature" – meaning a more open society and a landscape of

---

[427] Long, "Woodlands," 76-77, 149; Smith, 76 (n. 3).
[428] WH to Thomas Parke and, separately, to BHS, 2 November 1785, as quoted in Long, "Woodlands," 95. On Hamilton's relationship with Barclay, see Long, "Woodlands," 93-95.
[429] Brigham, 97.
[430] Joyce E. Chaplin, "Nature and Nation: Natural History in Context" in Sue Ann Prince, ed., *Stuffing Birds, Pressing Plants, Shaping Knowledge: Natural History in North America, 1730-1860* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2003), 76.

abundance.[431] Emigration was not an option. Hamilton missed his friends and further confided in one of them that England "has no charms for me without a great deal of Money." But when he sailed for America, he did so determined to "make it smile" by applying the lessons he had learned about horticulture and experimental farming.[432]

This was a characteristic compromise of the age. In Boston, New York and other urban centers, men who shared Hamilton's wealth and aspirations were caught in a struggle between their desire for material expressions of affluence and a set of social values drawn from Protestant tradition and republican ideals that censured such displays. As Tamara Thornton has shown, escape from this paradox lay in recasting luxury as a civilizing rather than a corrupting influence. Through this transformation, the "ideal of the virtuous citizen, subordinating considerations of private gain to public good" might remain intact, even as the wheels of conspicuous consumption spun into motion; *personal* demonstrations of taste, learning, and the techniques of scientific agriculture might serve the purpose of *national* uplift.[433]

After 1790, William Hamilton participated in an ever-widening social network. His correspondence with leading botanists increased. He sent an enormous shipment of plants to George Washington, drawn both from The Woodlands and from John Bartram, Jr.'s nursery. The American Philosophical Society entrusted him with the care of Indian exotics and, in 1797, elected him a member.[434] These developments placed Hamilton amid an energetic group of scientists, ranging from academicians to and gentleman amateurs. What place would he carve for himself? The role of unrivalled collector evidently appealed to him but that niche required maintenance. Visitation was crucial. Thus Hamilton periodically implored Humphry Marshall to spend time at The Woodlands, adding a hint of reproach when Marshall passed through town unannounced.[435] Other relationships proved more rewarding. Joined to Hamilton through the Philosophical Society, Thomas Jefferson arranged for him to receive the seeds obtained by Lewis and Clark (an honor Hamilton shared with Bernhard M'Mahon). In 1809, the third President also ensured that his grandson had

---

[431] WH to Thomas Parke, 24 September 1785, Ferdinand Dreer Coll., HSP; see also WH to Parke, 28 July 1785, Society Coll., HSP. For immediate historical context, see Long, "Woodlands," 108-109. On the relationship between nationalism and contemporary conceptions of landscape, see Nygren, 17-21, 25.
[432] WH to Thomas Parke, 2 November 1785, Ferdinand Dreer Coll., HSP; WH to BHS, 30 September 1785.
[433] Tamara Plakins Thornton, *Cultivating Gentlemen: The Meaning of County Life among the Boston Elite 1785—1860* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 7 (see also introduction, *passim*). My summary oversimplifies Thornton's argument and, worse yet, ignores its regional context. Boston's late-eighteenth-century gentlemen farmers derived their wealth from commerce and faced a different sort of struggle for ruling-class legitimacy than a William Hamilton, whose land-based fortune placed him closer to the English gentry. Nonetheless, Hamilton lived in the New World and participated in the ideological gymnastics of his Boston counterparts; Thornton's story has wider relevance than she lets on.
[434] Long, "Woodlands," 148-49, 156, 161.
[435] Hamilton to Marshall, 22 November 1790, 23 November 1796, 3 May 1799, in *Memorials of John Bartram and Humphry Marshall*, ed. William Darlington, (Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blackiston, 1849), 577-580.

access to The Woodlands as a lesson in botany and "as the chastest model of gardening which I have ever seen out of England."[436]

Today, Hamilton is remembered mostly for the species he introduced to America. The Lombardy poplar leads the list (partly on account of its use as a street tree), followed by the Gingko and the Norway Maple.[437] Attending to his roles as patron and employer might supplement such littanys with a more complex and collective story. One line of research could take up the working lives of George Hilton, John Lyon, and Frederick Pursh, along with those laborers whose names have fallen from the record. Hamilton sent Hilton and Lyon into the Pennsylvania mountains on plant-hunting trips.[438] How common was such an assignment in a nation where few could afford the cost? What was the botanical or ornamental value of the finds?

Most of all, a focus on acquisition sheds light on the Hamilton celebrated by contemporaries. It was to The Woodlands that Benjamin Smith Barton, Professor of Natural History and Botany at the University of Pennsylvania, brought his students for contact with living specimens.[439] Portuguese naturalist Hippolyto Jose da Costa visited Hamilton in 1799 and discovered "many plants from China and Brazil," while, in the garden, François André Michaux saw "All the trees and shrubs of the United States, at least those that can support winter in the open air."[440] The collection, then, was both intensive and expansive. Locals might catch glimpses of exotics – "that rare curiosity – an Aloe in bloom" – while a learned foreigner like Pursh could acquaint himself with native species before departing on a trip to the interior.[441] Self-consciously international collections of plants were all but unknown in this inward-turning period of American natural history. Bereft of a patron class and of federal funding, scientific enterprise in the New Republic generally occurred on a small scale and supported nationalistic aims.[442] Hamilton had created an exception, a cosmopolitan oasis near the first seat of federal government.

Closely related to The Woodlands' scientific value were its aesthetic appeal and influence on landscape architecture. Several of Hamilton's gardeners went on to

---

[436] Jefferson to WH, 7 May 1809, Jefferson Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society, as quoted in Long, "Woodlands," 160.
[437] An early list even included "the sycamore, the witch elm and the Tartian maple" (Oldschool, 507). See also *From Seed to Flower*, 21; Harshberger, *Botanists of Philadelphia*, 434.
[438] Joseph and Nesta Ewan, "John Lyon," 7.
[439] Ward, 164; Thomas Jefferson to WH, 7 May 1809, Jefferson Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society, as quoted in Long, "Woodlands," 161.
[440] Robert C. Smith, trans. and ed., "A Portuguese Naturalist in Philadelphia, 1799," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 78, no. 1 (Jan 1954): 94-95; François André Michaux, *Travels to the Westward of the Allegheny Mountains, in the States of the Ohio, Kentucky, and Tennessee, and Return to Charlestown, through the Upper Carolinas* (London: W. Flint for J. Mawman, 1805), 27. On the elder and younger Michaux's visits to The Woodlands, see Henry Savage, Jr., and Elizabeth J. Savage, *André and François André Michaux* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1986), 103-104, 114, 214.
[441] *Philadelphia Merchant: The Diary of Thomas P. Cope, 1800—1851*, ed. Eliza Cope Harrison (South Bend, Indiana: Gateway Editions Ltd., 1978), 160 (see also 184); Pursh, 1, viii-ix.
[442] Chaplin, 82-84; Simon Baatz, "Philadelphia Patronage: The Institutional Structure of Natural History in the New Republic, 1800-1833," *Journal of the Early Republic* 8 (Summer 1988): 112, 122-123.

shape other estates; John McArran's work at Lemon Hill is a case in point.[443] Yet, of the many visitors who passed through and derived some tip or idea, Joshua Francis Fisher may be unique in confessing to emulation. Even in a state of decay, The Woodlands had captured his youthful imagination and "create[d] a passion for gardening which has lasted through my life, and, in certain degree, been gratified by the much inferior Place I have formed for myself."[444] That place was Alverthorpe in nearby Jenkintown, laid out in the 1840s with help from Andrew Jackson Downing.[445]

Downing himself commemorated The Woodlands as one of "the two best specimens of the modern style," supplying a useful catchall.[446] The label recalls Thomas Whately's influential book, the one Hamilton purchased in England and seems to have read with care. More broadly, it was the modern-ness of The Woodlands that made it so striking on this side of the Atlantic, so visited and so scrutinized. Hamilton was not the only gentleman farmer to combine "picturesque" landscape design with graduated flower beds or expansive conservatories. Similar features turned up at Theodore Lyman's The Vale near Boston and Thomas Jefferson's Monticello, to cite only two well-known examples.[447] What Hamilton accomplished – and had the wealth to accomplish – was an early and skillful use of these elements.

But The Woodlands was more than a static assemblage: it was a living nexus, a crossroads of plants and people, a node in network of concrete and symbolic exchange. Employment there connected a Pursh to a Bartram, a Muhlenberg, and a Barton.[448] At a time when Philadelphia led the nation in art and science, Hamilton stepped forward as a central broker of taste and learning, and The Woodlands made that role possible. No passive backdrop, it served an agent of its owner's ambition. There were the rooms filled with paintings and statues, unfolding on a landscape as fashionable, as erudite, and as costly. There was the conservatory, its neatly staggered contents suggesting an almost imperial reach.

Collecting, entertaining, and conducting tours might all be construed as public acts. Hamilton's peers made this case, both to him and to each other. Jefferson wrote, "your collection is really a noble one, & in making & attending to it you have deserved well of your county."[449] After describing The Woodlands to polite readers of *The Port Folio* in December of1809, Joseph Dennie concluded:

> These improvements, it is said, fill up the leisure, and form the most agreeable occupation of its possessor; and that he may long live to pursue his refined pleasure, must be the wish of the public

---

[443] Joseph and Nest Ewan, "John Lyon," 7 (n.12).
[444] Joshua Francis Fisher, *Recollections*, 220 (see also 218, and Ward, 163-164).
[445] Constance M. Greiff, *John Notman, Architect 1810-1865* (Philadelphia: Athenaeum of Philadelphia, 1979), 166.
[446] Downing, 44.
[447] *Thomas Jefferson's Garden Book*, 330-335, pl. XXIII; Nichols and Griswold, 113; Thornton, 22-24.
[448] Joseph Ewan, "Frederick Pursh," 604.
[449] Jefferson to WH, 1 March 1808, in *Thomas Jefferson's Garden Book,* 366.

> at large, for to them so much liberality has ever been shown in the free access to the house and grounds, that of the enjoyment of the fruits of his care and cultivated taste, it may truly be said, *Non sibi sed aliis*.[450]

That last assertion, Not for himself but for others, gives public cover to what might otherwise have seemed a flagrantly private pastime. It is the language of noblesse oblige, of educating by example. Traded among elites, it sprang from a national discourse on luxury, virtue, and the fate of the republic. Yet if Hamilton participated in cultural strategies that cast opulence as refinement and refinement as altruism, simple self-interest does not adequately explain the complex phenomenon of The Woodlands. In order to be cosmopolitan and edifying, aristocratic horticulture required an audience. This, too, Hamilton obtained and cultivated. By maintaining a vast and much-visited collection of plants he contributed to the flow of ideas that defined American natural history's nascent public sphere.

What was The Woodlands? Through this line of reasoning, it starts to resemble an early museum, analogous, perhaps, to Charles Willson Peale's.[451] The similarities were real enough. Like Peale, Hamilton brought fine art together with Enlightenment science and an accompanying urge toward classification and display. The difference lay in the degree of privacy. Sharing Peale's interest in national uplift but lacking his republican convictions, Hamilton limited admission to "every *genteel* stranger."[452] It was an idea with an enduring legacy in the Philadelphia landscape tradition.

Competing Uses in the Age of Coal

In September, 1808, English artist William Birch advertised the first number of his lavish picture book, *The Country Seats of the United States*. Like so many of Hamilton's peers, Birch subscribed to the principle of uplift through example. As he stated in the introduction, "The Fine Arts are, as to the American Nation at large, in their infancy; to promote them in propagating Taste with the habit of rural retirement, supported by the growing wealth of the Nation, will be to form the National character favorable to the civilization of this young country, and establish that respectability which will add to its strength."[453] Birch was acquainted with Hamilton and, after choosing a site for a villa he could ill afford, had sought and obtained Hamilton's approval. That The Woodlands should appear in *Country Seats* was overdetermined. That it should appear with a standard (if flattering) description suggests the estate was

---

[450] Oldschool, 507. On *The Port Folio,* see E. Digby Baltzell, *Philadelphia Gentleman: The Making of a National Upper Class* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1979), 151.

[451] Thomas Jefferson made this connection explicit when he wrote to Dr. Caspar Wistar on 21 June 1807, stating that Wistar's anatomical collection, Peale's museum, and Hamilton's garden together comprised the basis of a scientific education; see *Thomas Jefferson's Garden Book*, 349.

[452] James Mease, *The Picture of Philadelphia, Giving an Account of Its Origin, Increase and Improvements In Arts, Sciences, Manufactures, Commerce and Revenue* (Philadelphia: B. & T. Kite, 1811), 348; the emphasis is mine. See also Stetson, 29, on the estate's semi-public function.

[453] William Birch, *The Country Seats of the United States of North America* (Springland, Pennsylvania: by the author, 1808), unpaged.

less important here in its own right than as part of a gathering geographical idea: the lower Schuylkill as a discrete and coherent entity, epitomizing "rural retirement" and all that that phrase implied.[454]

In a sense, though, Birch's handsome publication was already out of date. By about 1810, villas closest to Philadelphia had passed the peak of their fashionability and were heading into a period of flux. New turnpikes allowed the wealthy to move further a field in the summer months or to depart for shorter periods, visiting spas and springs. Some country houses were still going up a few miles from town, but they tended to be smaller than their predecessors. The pace of change accelerated in the 1820s. Completion of the Fairmount Dam created stagnant water and widespread fears of disease. At the same time, the anthracite coal business brought down ever-larger shipments from the interior. Traffic on the river increased, as did wharf rents and demand for wharf space.[455]

Several fates might have befallen The Woodlands in this period. Rapid growth was pushing asylums and prisons further from Philadelphia's core while new theories of reform suggested such institutions belonged in a suburban setting.[456] In April of 1828, typefounder James Ronaldson wrote to Quaker philanthropist Roberts Vaux, asking him to find work for an acquaintance. The man in question had strong opinions about the proper location of the city's new almshouse and these Vaux relayed: "the Woodlands estate should be bought for that purpose, the more land he says the better."[457] Hamilton's mansion escaped this scheme but 187 acres of his former property to the east soon accommodated the Blockley Alms House. Across the river, the U.S. Naval Asylum took shape, designed by the same architect along similar lines. Promoters of Philadelphia's first rural cemetery also eyed Hamilton's grounds. In late 1835, a group interested in that cause sent librarian John Jay Smith to inquire about the site's availability. After being rebuffed, Smith's cohort turned instead to Laurel Hill, located further up the river.[458]

The Woodlands mansion was probably serving as a boardinghouse at the time of Smith's inquiries.[459] Like comparably situated villas, it had reached a stage of intensive usage that reflected the city's proximity and changing economic needs. Upriver, the Breck family's country seat now hosted the Sweetbriar Ice Company. Closer to town, the Sedgeley and Lemon Hill estates were slated for redevelopment as

---

[454] Martin P. Snyder, "William Birch: His 'Country Seats of the United States,'" *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 81, no. 3 (July 1957): 232, 243-244; Aaron Wunsch, "Schuylkill River Villas," HABS PA-6184 (1995).

[455] Snyder, "William Birch," 225, 243, 246; Downing, 42-43; Richardson, 209, 230, 239; Wainwright, 268-269; Long, "Woodlands," 4-6; J. Thomas Scharf and Thompson Westcott, *History of Philadelphia, 1609-1884* (Philadelphia: L. H. Everts & Co., 1884), 3: 2271-2272.

[456] Webster, 159-160, 196-197.

[457] James Ronaldson to Roberts Vaux, 17 April 1828, Vaux Papers, HSP. See Long, "Woodlands," 175-180, on the subsequent development of the Blockley Alms House.

[458] Minute Book of Meetings of The Trustees and Managers of the Laurel Hill Cemetery Company, 14 and 23 November 1834, Laurel Hill Cemetery Company Coll.

[459] Undated clipping in the Free Library of Philadelphia's Castner Coll., v. 43, p. 21.

coal wharves.[460] A similar plan hovered over The Woodlands and much was at stake in the outcome. What started as a business proposal soon launched competing claims on public sympathy and competing definitions of the public good. In the end, it was political maneuvering, not public discourse, that provided resolution.

When conveyancer Thomas Mitchell purchased The Woodlands in August of 1831, boardinghouse ownership was hardly his main ambition. The Schuylkill Canal had opened six years earlier, stretching 108 miles to Port Carbon and providing a major conduit for the state's most promising commodity. A mere 6,500 tons of anthracite coal traveled down the channel in its first year of operation but by 1835 annual tonnage had climbed to 339,508, filling wharves along Philadelphia's western waterfront and creating boat traffic that bordered on chaos.[461] Mitchell may have had ties to the coal business.[462] Watching this process unfold, he saw the need for more wharves and easier transshipment. Moreover, he had reason to expect encouragement from the Commonwealth. Locked in tight competition with New York and Maryland, Pennsylvania's General Assembly had committed to funding an enormous network of canals and had recently approved construction of a dogleg around the western abutment of Philadelphia's Permanent Bridge.[463] Local parties might squabble, but regional interest in "improvements" was stronger than ever.

What Mitchell had in mind was a canal on the west bank of the Schuylkill River. Running two and a half miles from Fairmount Dam to just above Mill Creek, it would allow coal boats to travel alongside the river, unloading their freight onto wharves or directly onto sea-going vessels. At the terminus, a tear-shaped basin was planned as a turnaround where boatmen would commence their trek up a towpath on the canal's landward side.[464] Much about the proposal remains unclear. While surveys of the

---

[460] Elizabeth Milroy, "Assembling Fairmount Park," in Katherine Martinez and Page Talbot, eds., *Philadelphia's Cultural Landscape: The Sartain Family Legacy* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000), 73-74; Owen Tasker Robbins, "Toward a Preservation of the Grounds of Lemon Hill in Light of Their Past and Present Significance for Philadelphians," MA thesis, University of Pennsylvania (1987), 43; Aaron Wunsch, "Lemon Hill," HABS PA-1010 (1995), p. 3; idem, "Sweetbriar," HABS PA-1670 (1995), 2; Snyder, "William Birch," 243, 246.

[461] Richardson, 239; Wainwright, 267-269; *Journal of the Select Council of the City of Philadelphia,* (Philadelphia: Charles Alexander), 21 April 1836.

[462] Sometime in the 1830s, Thomas Mitchell began renting wharves at The Woodlands to the Delaware Coal Company. Suggestively, an Ebenezer Mitchell spoke out on the company's behalf, stressing the benefits of Thomas Mitchell's proposal. See *Plan of the City of Philadelphia and Adjoining Districts*; *Proceedings of the Special Committee of the Select and Common Councils of the City of Philadelphia, Appointed to Report Upon the Subject of the Western Canal* ([1835]), 7. On the contemporary intertwining of real estate, canal, and coal investments, see Donna Rilling, *Making Houses, Crafting Capitalism: Builders in Philadelphia, 1790-1850* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), 43.

[463] See materials relating to "An Act to authorize the Governor to Incorporate a Company to make a Canal Navigation round the western abutment of the Permanent Bridge over the River Schuylkill at the City of Philadelphia," passed by the General Assembly, 4 April 1831, West Philadelphia Canal Co. Records (folder no. 54 in Internal Improvements File, Records of the Department of State [R.G. 29]), Pennsylvania State Archives. Although Thomas Mitchell's project sometimes went by the name of the West Philadelphia Canal, the two ventures appear unrelated.

[464] *Proceedings of the Special Committee of the Select and Common Councils*, 4; *Plan and Section of a Survey for a Canal commencing at Fair Mount Dam and extending along the western slope of the River*

route were made in 1833, other preparations may have commenced when Mitchell took title to The Woodlands or, for that matter, even earlier. Then there is the problem of identification. Official documents refer to the project as the Western or West Philadelphia Canal but a host of other names circulated in common parlance. Contemporaries did not agonize over these distinctions. They focused instead on the proposed canal's course and possible ramifications.

Local concern rose in late 1834 as the state legislature considered Mitchell's application for a charter. Responding to alarmed petitioners, Philadelphia's City Councils formed an investigative committee and that body held hearings over several weeks. Radically different positions emerged. Strong support for the canal came from men in the coal business – mostly merchants but also boatmen familiar with practical aspects of the trade. They stressed the inadequacy of extant wharf facilities: the limited space, the "extravagantly high" rents, the delays caused by tides, storms, and congestion. It was sometimes unclear how Mitchell's venture would solve these problems. Aside from providing competition, the canal's principal benefit was understood to be its high elevation. Standing twelve and a half feet above low tide, the waterway would allow boatmen to dump coal onto wharves rather than heaving it upward from a precarious position on the river. Engineers and a doctor weighed in. The canal, they claimed, would make efficient use of water and reduce the threat of "fluvial diseases" by eliminating marshes and stagnant pools. Finally, two committee members who sided with these views produced an eloquent written summary. Casting their argument in broad terms, they intoned ominously, "While our citizens are lulled into security, our neighbors have been executing works by which nearly one half of the coal of Pennsylvania will pass away for ever from our markets to theirs."[465]

Unmentioned amid this boosterism were the more circumscribed benefits that might accrue to Thomas Mitchell. Some hint of that windfall came through in predictions about the canal's impact on the neighboring Alms House property. (There, the waterfront "could be immediately converted into depots for the shipping of coal, producing a large income to the city, if rented; or greatly reducing the amount of debt on that property if sold.")[466] In general, though, profits remained abstract and impersonal, sustaining city and state by nurturing a crucial sector of the economy.

Canal opponents agreed that public interests were at issue. In their eyes, the threat to those interests came not from any failure to promote a burgeoning business but from the "monopoly" that a charter would confer on owners of the new landings.[467] Classic Jacksonian rhetoric came into play, stressing the virtues of the free market

---

Schuylkill to Mill Creek. Laid down from surveys made during the year 1833. By J. Edgar Thomson, Civil Engr. Drawn by John C. Trautwine, Asst. Engr., Charles Fenderich, litho., in Records of the Bureau of Land Records (R.G. 17), Map Book / Box 7, p. 28 1/2, Pennsylvania State Archives. The latter citation courtesy of Donna Rilling.

[465] *Proceedings of the Special Committee of the Select and Common Councils,* 17.

[466] Ibid., 17-18.

[467] *Memorial to the Legislature Respecting a Canal on the West Side of the Schuylkill. Read in Select and Common Councils, January 29, 1835, and passed*, (Philadelphia: n.p., 1835), 4, 6.

and the evils of corporations. Wharf rents might have increased, but only in proportion to the coal trade's prosperity. Demand would soon lead to development of additional wharves, and state interference could only divert commerce from its "natural channel." Moreover, the water in Mitchell's canal was not his to take. Rights to the river's power had belonged to the Schuylkill Navigation Company. When the city agreed to build the dam and canal at Fairmount, it had effectively purchased from the company all water flowing past that point.[468]

This last premise was questionable but it satisfied several constituencies. Frederick Graff was Chief Engineer of the Waterworks and its tireless defender. In his estimation any large drain on the Fairmount pool put the city at risk. Worse still, he suspected Mitchell of harboring grand ambitions: "Should this canal be Sanctioned to mill creek, there cannot be a doubt but that it will soon be extended to the mouth of the Schuylkill… In that case after the city has expended upwards of 370,000 dollars for the purchase of the water power and erecting the Dam, The Fair Mount Waterworks will become deficient of water, at a time perhaps when fire shall be rageing [sic]."[469] Quieter but equally jealous custodians of the Schuylkill sat on city's Watering Committee. Members of Philadelphia's bicameral city council, they had long wished to develop land south of the waterworks for industrial purposes and in some cases had a personal stake in doing so. Waterpower was key to their plans.[470]

Whatever their motives, Mitchell's opponents agreed on his hubris and avarice. Of those city councilors assigned to investigate his proposal, a majority concluded that its benefits for the coal business were negligible. At best, that trade would be "transferred from its present site to a lower point on the river, to the injury of two hundred thousand people, and for the benefit of a few owners of land near Mill Creek, who are not satisfied with a competition with their neighbors, but seek for exclusive privileges to which they are in no way entitled."[471] Frederick Graff's presentations may have proven decisive here. Superimposing Mitchell's scheme onto detailed maps, he showed the canal standing an average distance of 400 feet from the river's low water mark.[472] Most "wharf lots" were improbably long strips of marshland. Only The Woodlands had deepwater access, and its Mill Creek frontage made it

---

[468] Ibid., 6-7. This useful claim was later invalidated by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court. See Jane Mork Gibson, "The Fairmount Waterworks," *Bulletin of the Philadelphia Museum of Art* 84, nos. 360-361 (Summer 1988): 17-18, 30.

[469] Frederick Graff, "Plan of the Schuylkill River, from Fair Mount to the Delaware," 7 January 1835, penned onto *Chart of the River Schuylkill From Fair Mount to its Mouth. By Order of the Councils. Surveyed and Constructed by David McClure. B. Tanner, Sc. Entered According to Act of Congress; the Twenty first day of August, 1828, by the Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of Philadelphia, of the State of Pennsylvania*, Frederick Graff Coll. 56-25-7, Print Dept., Philadelphia Museum of Art.

[470] Gibson, 23; I rely here also on a typescript history of the waterworks generously shown to me by its author, Laurence Eisenlohr. Citing Watering Committee records, Eisenlohr emphasizes the influence of the Schuylkill Navigation Company and the Morrisville Estate on that body.

[471] *Memorial to the Legislature Respecting a Canal on the West Side of the Schuylkill*, 6.

[472] Graff, "Plan of the Schuylkill River, from Fair Mount to the Delaware"; [Frederick Graff], "Plan of the River Schuylkill From Fair Mount to its junction with the Delaware River," n.d., penned on 1828 Tanner map (see fn. 470), Frederick Graff Collection, Gr VIII: 5., The Franklin Institute Science Museum, Philadelphia. I am grateful to Jane Mork Gibson for directing me to these sources.

doubly desirable. This circumstance clinched Graff's case. Contending that "the canal will be useless to the landholders on the river (except to those who own the Basin near Mill Creek)" he insisted on calling the venture "the Mill Creek canal."[473]

Such arguments won the first round. After hearing from their joint committee, City Councils sent an angry memorial to the legislature demanding Mitchell's application be denied. State lawmakers hesitated and Mitchell pressed on. By December of 1835, he was again petitioning the General Assembly for a charter, to the councils' alarm and dismay.[474] His ally in this process was Thomas Kittera. A man of substantial wealth, Kittera served as Mitchell's counsel at public meetings but his ties to the canal scheme went deeper. The previous year, he had paid $15,000 for three-eighths of The Woodlands, helping Mitchell meet the terms of a heavy mortgage.[475] Now the two men were de facto business partners, though the deed that bound them remained off the public record. Candor also ran short among the opposition. Unable to flout Mitchell's plan through legitimate means, they assembled anti-canal petitions by hiring signature collectors who paid two cents per name.[476]

At the center of the conflict lay the question of water rights. Members of the Select and Common Councils stood firm in their belief that the city had "purchased the whole surplus of the water and water-power of the Schuylkill, at Fairmount"[477] One way of protecting that claim was by repeatedly asserting it before the legislature. Another strategy was to suggest use of an alternative water source, effectively making the rights question mute. Although the former approach was the councilors' mainstay, they made increasing use of the latter starting in the spring of 1836.[478]

Their idea sounded like a compromise. Acknowledging at last the defects of existing wharves, they set out to replicate the advantages of Mitchell's canal with a system of basins and tide-locks. Several long pools would be strung together just east of the route Mitchell had identified. Here, coal boats could supposedly remain afloat at a near-constant level, buoyed by tidewater that entered at the extremities of the complex and was trapped there by gates. A crescent-shaped string of wharves would separate the basins from the river, receiving boats on one side and ships on the other.[479] It was an inelegant proposal and Mitchell held out. Aware of Mill Creek's centrality to his plan, he purchased the sliver separating The Woodlands from the creek's mouth in July. His adversaries' technology might even come in handy here. Working on this assumption, Mitchell secured a deed conferring the right to build a

---

[473] Graff, "Plan of the Schuylkill River, from Fair Mount to the Delaware," verso inscription.
[474] *Journal of the Select Council,* 31 December 1835.
[475] *Proceedings of the Special Committee of the Select and Common Councils,* 14; unrecorded deed, 17 January 1834, WCCC.
[476] *Journal of the Common Council of the City of Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: J. Van Court), 28 January 1836; Eisenlohr TMs.
[477] *Journal of the Common Council* and *Journal of the Select Council*, 24 March 1836.
[478] But the basic idea had surfaced at least a year earlier. See *Memorial to the Legislature Respecting a Canal on the West Side of the Schuylkill*, 3-4.
[479] *Journal of the Select Council*, 25 February, 21 April 1836.

tide lock "of such width as to admit Sloops to enter."[480] By winter, the whole enterprise was moving forward. Again Mitchell applied for a charter, and now, despite a lengthy remonstrance from City Councils, the Senate complied.[481]

In the end it was not enough. Councils pulled out all the stops, buying advertisements in local papers and securing the allegiance of neighboring municipalities by suggesting the City might break its water contracts if the Fairmount pool were diminished.[482] Frederick Graff spent long periods lobbying in Harrisburg. Faced with the prospect of continued conflict, and, perhaps, with financial losses stemming from the Panic of 1837, Mitchell ultimately joined some of his fiercest opponents in backing the tidal-basin proposal. In 1838, this plan went so far as to receive preliminary approval from the legislature under the name of The Philadelphia Tide Lock Company.[483] After that it vanished, perhaps for want of subscribers and capital, or perhaps for lack of genuine interest on the part of its originators.

From Subdivision to Cemetery

On October 21, 1838, Philadelphia patrician Sidney George Fisher wrote in his diary:

> Sunday. Cloudy, damp and cool. At 10, took my favorite ride, out old Balt[imore] turnpike to a lane in the woods & home by West-Chester road… Stopped at the Woodlands & went in. Never was there before. It is one of the finest old places in the country. A very large & handsome house is seated near the river, in the midst of what may well be called a park, even now. The ground is very undulating, & covered with groups of noble forest trees. The view is extensive and beautiful… It is now owned by Mitchel [sic], the conveyancer, who bought it on speculation, & it will probably before long be dismantled, disforested & cut up into town lots. It is rapidly going to decay now.[484]

If the estate's bleak prospects weighed on Fisher, they suited his Romantic prose and his "sombre & gloomy" state of mind. A year and a half later, Mitchell's plans had changed, as had Fisher's outlook. He noted:

> Rode with Mitchell out to the Woodlands, he having offered to take me & show me his plans. He bought the place from Miss Hamilton some years ago for $30,000, & considers it worth $120,000. He proposes to convert it into a cemetery, & expects to make a great deal of money. I think it not improbable. Wants me

---

[480] Mary Jones et al. to Thomas Mitchell, 23 July 1836, Deed Book S.H.F. v. 11, p. 347 and following.
[481] *Journal of the Select Council*, 22 December 1836, 20 February 1837.
[482] *Journal of the Select Council*, 20 February 1837, 1 February 1838; Eisenlohr TMs.
[483] *An Act to Incorporate the Philadelphia Tide Lock Company, Passed the Sixteenth Day of April, 1838* (Philadelphia: John C. Clark, pr., 1838).
[484] *A Philadelphia Perspective: The Diary of Sidney George Fisher Covering the Years 1834 – 1871*, ed. Nicholas B. Wainwright (Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1967), 60-61.

> to take a share. I hope it may succeed because in that case its fine old trees & beauty will be preserved.[485]

That a cemetery should emerge as a promising successor to a failed canal scheme requires some explanation. Two decades earlier, the idea would have struck most Philadelphians as bizarre and even immoral but the processes that made it possible were well underway by then. Urbanization was one of them. Between 1800 and 1840, greater Philadelphia's population jumped from 67,811 to 231,702. Churchyards began filling up as did "potter's fields," the traditional burial place of paupers, "strangers," and African-Americans. This transformation was made all the more disturbing by recent memories of yellow fever epidemics. Medical science increasingly tied the disease to noxious "miasmas" that hovered over damp or decaying matter. Aware of these discussions, City Councils passed an ordinance outlawing burials in the public squares, home to some of the city's most heavily used potter's fields. The law took effect in 1812 as construction commenced on a redesigned waterworks.[486]

Beyond strictly practical concerns over health and space, broader shifts in American attitudes towards death and the body were starting to play out in the landscape. As Dell Upton has recently summarized, "After the late eighteenth century, the older traditions dictating respect for the corpse were reinforced in bourgeois culture by an exaggerated sentimental attachment to the body as the vessel of individual personality."[487] Disturbances of graves in overcrowded churchyards were construed as attacks on the newly sentimentalized corpse. Moreover, churchyard burial entailed high fees and was limited to members of an established sect. During the mid 1820s, Philadelphians joined voluntary associations in order to address these problems. The result was an array of new graveyards based on "the mutual or associate plan."[488]

First came the Mutual Burying-Ground, founded in 1826 on the south side of Prime Street, now Washington Avenue. Union Burying-Ground soon followed, as did the Machpelah and Philanthropic Cemeteries, all on the city's southern fringe. What bound these institutions was a commitment to respectable, low-cost burial in an orderly arrangement: most or all were laid out on a grid.[489] In this sense they were heirs to Connecticut's New Haven Burying Ground. Established thirty years earlier as an alternative to the town green, the New Haven model responded to contemporary concerns over health and security by treating grave lots as private property, overseen

---

[485] Ibid., 100.
[486] Sam Bass Warner, Jr., *The Private City: Philadelphia in Three Periods of Its Growth* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968), 51; Scharf and Westcott, 3: 2355-2357; Sloane, 29, 34-39.
[487] Dell Upton, "The Urban Cemetery and the Urban Community: The Origin of the New Orleans Cemetery," in Annmarie Adams and Sally McMurry, eds., *Exploring Everyday Landscapes: Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture, VII* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1997), 134. See also Stanley French, "The Cemetery as Cultural Institution: The Establishment of Mount Auburn and the 'Rural Cemetery' Movement," *American Quarterly* 26, no. 1 (March 1974): 39-43.
[488] Scharf and Westcott, 1: 620.
[489] Ibid., 1:620, 3:2359.

by a non-sectarian citizens group.[490] Typefounder James Ronaldson admired these ideas, at least as a starting point. When he developed Philadelphia Cemetery in the late 1820s, he employed a tidy grid but supplemented it with trees and such amenities as a lodge in which bodies could be monitored for signs of life prior to interment. Ronaldson also sorted his clientele more carefully than the associations. His was a business venture, a company that dealt exclusively with white customers and allowed them to erect lot enclosures in certain rows of the grid.[491]

Just as Philadelphia's gridded cemeteries showed signs of adapting to up-market tastes, wildness began supplanting order as the touchstone of fashionability. Boston's Mount Auburn Cemetery unleashed new aesthetic impulses. Opened in 1831, the institution sprang from scientific interest in sanitation and horticulture, as well as from an elegiac view of death ushered in by literary Romanticism. This last idea did much to determine the landscape's form. Here, commemorative elements of the English garden were recast with an eye to French precedent, specifically to Père Lachaise Cemetery, near Paris. The result mixed urbanity with isolation. Some ten miles from Boston, a "garden of graves" took root on a wooded parcel at the Cambridge-Watertown line. Presiding over this transformation was Jacob Bigelow. A founder of the Massachusetts Horticultural Society, he shared with its members a firm position among the Boston elite and an equally firm belief in the redemptive power of "rural pursuits."[492]

Philadelphians scrutinized Mount Auburn. Boston's cultural anxieties and sanitary challenges did not seem so remote. At the same time, the rural cemetery movement was an Anglo-American project.[493] When the Quaker City's leaders discussed urban reform, they often invoked English models, and burial planning was no exception.[494] Laurel Hill was Philadelphia's first rural cemetery. Like Mount Auburn, it stood outside the city, overlooking a river and offering the distant views so necessary to the humbling contemplation of human life. Like London's Kensal Green Cemetery, Laurel Hill was cultivated and open. Instead of Mount Auburn's dense groves, it featured small clumps of trees and many isolated specimens: horticultural delicacy was the overriding concern. At the center lay a geometrical feature called the

---

[490] Sloane, 30-32.
[491] Scharf and Westcott, 1: 620; *Philadelphia Cemetery: Copy of the Deeds of Trust, Charter, By-Laws, and List of Lot-Holders; with an Account of the Cemetery* (Philadelphia: Mifflin & Parry, 1845), 1, 6, 8-9.
[492] While the literature on Mount Auburn is substantial, the only full-length treatment is Blanche Linden-Ward, *Silent City on a Hill: Landscapes of Memory and Boston's Mount Auburn Cemetery* (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1989). Sloane offers useful insights (chap. 3), as does Thornton (pp. 166-168). On the English garden's influence on Père Lachaise, see Richard A. Etlin, "Père Lachaise and the Garden Cemetery," *Journal of Garden History* 4, no. 3 (July-September 1984): 214-215.
[493] David Schuyler, "The Evolution of the Anglo-American Rural Cemetery: Landscape Architecture as Social and Cultural History." *Journal of Garden History* 4, no. 3 (July-September 1984): 291-304.
[494] Indeed, English precedent had entered into the debates over Mitchell's canal. Advocates of the tide-lock alternative claimed their idea had "been long in use in London and Liverpool" (see *Journal of the Select Council*, 21 April 1836).

Shrubbery. A radial arrangement of planting beds, it nodded to Kensal Green and to the wider Reptonian repertoire on which that landscape was based.[495]

But for all these cosmopolitan allusions there was something distinctly local about Laurel Hill. Part of the explanation lay in the small size and compact arrangement of lots. Laurel Hill had fewer than twenty useable acres, compared to Mount Auburn's original seventy-two. While this circumstance dictated efficiency, the solution looked suspiciously like a contortion of Ronaldson's grid.[496] Then there was the aura of genteel domesticity. Ignoring wild or pristine terrain, Philadelphia's cemetery promoters capitalized on their city's elite gardening tradition by carefully reworking the country seat of merchant Joseph Sims. Finally, Laurel Hill was a business corporation. Established by four partners in 1836, it was designed to make money and did so after a slow start.[497]

By the time Woodlands Cemetery came into being, one other local institution supplied a useful if mildly controversial example. This was Monument Cemetery. Situated on North Broad Street, it had briefly born the name Pere la Chaise until locals derided the reference as pretentious and unpatriotic. Physician John Abraham Elkinton was Monument's principal promoter. Starting in 1837, he raised capital through a joint stock company, a seventy-dollar share entitling the bearer to four lots. Tree-lined avenues gave the gridded grounds an air of urbane dignity. At the center, a node resembling Laurel Hill's Shrubbery served as a "square" in which republican heroes Washington and Lafayette would receive formal commemoration. Elkinton's background gave weight to his promotional claims: extramural burial was surely a boon to public health. Just as important was the project's overtly entrepreneurial orientation. Though very few American cemeteries adhered to this model before the Civil War, British cemetery speculation entered its heyday in the 1830s, and Monument confirmed Philadelphia as an outpost of the pattern.[498]

Mount Auburn's celebrity, Laurel Hill's success and Monument's promise might all have induced Thomas Mitchell to enter the cemetery business. But when Sidney George Fisher predicted that The Woodlands would soon be "disforested & cut up

---

[495] Keith N. Morgan, "The Emergence of the American Landscape Professional: John Notman and the Design of Rural Cemeteries", *Journal of Garden History* 4, no. 3 (1984): 269-89; James Stevens Curl, *The Victorian Celebration of Death* (Phoenix Mill [UK]: Stroud Publishing, 2000), 48-59; Laird, "*Corbeille, Parterre* and *Treillage*," 155 – 159; Wunsch, "Laurel Hill Cemetery," 17.

[496] This insight is part of Dell Upton's case for the essential urbanity of rural cemeteries. It appears in "Gridding the Graveyard," a chapter he has generously shown me from his forthcoming book.

[497] *Recollections of John Jay Smith,* ed. Elizabeth P. Smith (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1892), 101, 103, 291, 334; Wunsch, "Laurel Hill," 22, 76.

[498] Torchia, 13-16; Sloane, 128-134; *Articles of Association of The Monument Cemetery Company of Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: J. Thomson, pr., 1837), 4; Julie Rugg, "The Origins and Progress of Cemetery Establishment in Britain," in Peter C. Jupp and Glennys Howarth, eds., *The Changing Face of Death: Historical Accounts of Death and Disposal* (London: Macmillan, 1997), 106; idem, "Researching Early-Nineteenth-Century Cemeteries: Sources and Methods," *The Local Historian (Journal of the British Association for Local History)* 28, no. 3 (August 1998): 133, 137. As Rugg notes in the latter essay, "joint-stock companies need not necessarily be equated with the desire to make a profit." Their use for this purpose was confined largely to 1830s London and Edinburgh.

into town lots" was he referring to another plan? By the late 1830s, new construction was starting to dot West Philadelphia's grid.[499] The Western Canal was in trouble. A few coal wharves had gone in and the recently opened Lehman Street was a step towards a towpath, but the political odds looked insurmountable. Even if the canal could somehow be resuscitated, the upland part of Mitchell's property remained unproductive. The most straightforward solution was a residential or commercial subdivision. Fisher's diary suggests Mitchell entertained such a scheme, and other clues appear in cemetery founders' early plans to create building lots around the edges of their site.[500] Whatever the precise nature of this proposal, Woodlands Cemetery was less its successor than its sibling.

Thomas Mitchell was a conveyancer. Born in 1780, he had been in the business for almost forty years and had watched it change dramatically.[501] Conveyancing was still rote work at the turn of the century, a form of specialized scrivening that produced deeds and mortgages. Over the next few decades, however, the growing complexity of the real estate market had helped turn conveyancers into a new breed of professionals. As historian Donna Rillling has noted, "Many delegated copying jobs to subordinates and focused instead on reviewing title, arbitrating sales and purchases, researching legal complications, and mediating loans."[502] Mitchell belonged to this group. Part real estate broker and part title expert, he was also heavily invested in the market he served.

As the canal scheme faltered and local cemeteries prospered, Mitchell's plan evolved. Details of the transition are vague, but a latter-day newspaper article probably captures the correct sequence of events:

> In 1831, the [Woodlands] property came into the possession of Thomas Mitchell, of this city. About the latter part of 1839, Mr. Mitchell suggested the idea of a rural cemetery, and conferred with Mr. A. D. Cash, the well-known conveyancer. That gentleman concurred with Mr. Mitchell in regard to the feasibility of the project. Mr. Eli K. Price was next consulted, and to him…is due more than to anyone else the realization of the original design.[503]

If Mitchell wished to create a new sort of subdivision, one that capitalized on contemporary reformist impulses, he had tapped well-qualified consultants. Andrew D. Cash was an in-law and former business partner. He was also one of Monument

---

[499] Miller and Siry, 107; Rosenthal, 12-13.
[500] "Outline or Scheme of the Woodlands Cemetery Compy - Memoranda by Mr. Price", WCCC; Managers Minutes, 13 July 1840, 25 February 1843. Building lots could conceivably have been an earlier component of Mitchell's canal scheme, as they were in a similar proposal for Lemon Hill; see Milroy, 73-74.
[501] Biographical information on Mitchell is scant. His birth and death dates (1780 and 1849) appear on his tombstone at Woodlands Cemetery, where his body was moved from St. Paul's Episcopal churchyard. The start of his conveyancing career (ca. 1802) is mentioned in Miller v. Jacobs, 3 Watts 477 (Sup. Ct. Penna., Middle District 1835). Citation courtesy of Donna Rilling.
[502] Rilling, 59.
[503] "The Cemeteries of Philadelphia. – Woodlands Cemetery."

Cemetery's original subscribers.[504] Eli Price came up through a related channel. Born near West Chester to an established Quaker family, he had trained as a merchant in Philadelphia before switching to real estate law. The 1820s schism between Hicksite and Orthodox Friends produced conflicting claims to church property. While Price found these disputes painful on a personal level, his part in their resolution helped launch his career, earning him new contacts and a reputation for fairness. Familiarity with titles had fringe benefits. Like many of his elite peers, Price turned to urban real estate as a conservative investment strategy, joining local colleagues in some ventures and West Chester associates in others. But while his investments consumed increasing amounts of his time, it was legal skill and liberal beliefs that formed the basis of his public image. By the late 1830s, he had achieved adequate standing to deliver the cornerstone-laying address at the Preston Retreat, an innovative maternity hospital for Philadelphia's indigent women.[505]

As engines of urban reform, rural cemeteries stood in close company. Contemporary asylums, hospitals and schools drew on similar ideas, their founders convinced that even the most obdurate physical, mental, and sanitary problems might be solved through exposure to the proper environment.[506] Eli Price shared this conviction. Praising the Preston Retreat in his dedication address, he noted: "The location appears to be most favorable. – Upon a dry gravel soil – elevated into a pure atmosphere – enjoying an expansive and cheering prospect – with an open area, forever secured, of about eight acres – no contaminating influence from surrounding impurity or diseases can here reach your patients…."[507] Much the same language would attach to Woodlands Cemetery. In pure and secure conditions, birth and death were sanitized and sanctified as the fledgling metropolis expanded.

---

[504] Starting in 1828, A. D. Cash is listed in city directories. In 1825, however, Thomas Mitchell's partner is listed as "E. D. Cash," perhaps a typographical error. Mitchell's connection to the Cash family is mentioned in John M. Cowell, "The Family of Deborah Franklin," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 8, no. 4 (1884): 406. On Cash's subscription, see *Articles of Association of The Monument Cemetery Company,* 14; Benjamin G. Mitchell and Philip Price also appear on the list.

[505] [Eli K. Price], *Centennial Meeting of the Descendants of Philip and Rachel Price* (Philadelphia: Caxton Press of C. Sherman, Son & Co., 1864), 39-40; Futhey and Cope, 694, 696; Joseph T. Rothrock, "Biographical Memoir of the Late Honorable Eli K. Price, LL.D.," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 23, no. 124 (December 1886): 572-580; Benjamin H. Brewster, *Address on the Late Eli K. Price Delivered…before the Law Association of Philadelphia on November 15, 1886* (Philadelphia: Edward Stern & Co., pr., [1886]), 5-11; obituaries and miscellaneous newspaper clippings filed under Price's name, CCHS; Douglas R. Harper, *West Chester to 1865: That Elegant and Notorious Place* (West Chester, Pa.: Chester County Historical Society, 1999), chap. 53; Grantor and Grantee Indexes, 1830-1840, CPMA. On real estate as an elite form of investment, see Rilling, 42-43.

[506] David J. Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1971); John F. Sears, *Sacred Places: American Tourist Attractions in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 89-95; Richard A. Etlin, "Landscapes of Eternity: Funerary Architecture and the Cemetery, 1793-1881," *Oppositions* 8 (Spring 1977): 15; idem, "Pere Lachaise and the Garden Cemetery," 211; Carl Beneson Perloff, *The Asylum* (Philadelphia: Friends Hospital, 1994), 14-15, 46-50; Webster, 196-97, 212-13, 284-86, 308-09.

[507] [Eli K. Price], *The Address Delivered at the Corner-Stone Laying of the Preston Retreat, July 17, 1837* (Philadelphia: John Richards, pr., 1837), 5. Eminent lawyer John Sergeant was the institution's first president while his former understudy, Eli Price, served as treasurer. Eli's brother Philip was an original manager and member of the building committee (pp. 11-12). Failure of the Bank of the United States hobbled Dr. Jonas Preston's bequest, delaying the hospital's opening for thirty years (Webster, 286).

Beneath such environmentalism lay profound civic optimism. Institutions like the Preston Retreat were proof not merely of philanthropy's uplifting potential in modern society but of sensitized, masculine social progress itself. Price continued:

> It is an evidence of the growth and predominance of more gentle and nobler sentiments in man, when he consents to forgo the vulgar tyranny of superior physical power, and makes it a point of principle and honor to protect and shield from exposure the sex who abundantly repays him by an increase of happiness, for all that he contributes to her comfort and elevation of character. In this point of view the beautiful structure you are about to erect will be a monument commemorative of the civilization of the age.[508]

But eloquence and progressive views were only half of the equation. As important to Mitchell's cemetery plan was his partner's business experience. Historian Douglas Harper has analyzed Price's role in developing West Chester's Matlack Farm. While details of that story are irrelevant here, the outline reveals certain formulas that soon recurred at The Woodlands. Between 1835 and 1841, six investors joined forces to transform a large parcel on West Chester's northeastern fringe. Price was one of the group's two leaders. The other was David Townsend, a prominent banker and avid botanist whose collaboration with Price aided the flow of capital and legal expertise between Philadelphia and its western satellite. Robert Matlack's farm fetched $13,000 shortly after his death. Six years later, the buyers had made over $5,000 on their investment through the use of intertwined value-adding techniques.[509]

The most straightforward was subdivision. Matlack himself had started the process, aware that a railroad was coming to West Chester and that his property lay on the route. This head start allowed Price and his partners to auction off "a large number of town lots" within weeks of their purchase. But there was more to subdivision than surveying. Boundary lines and property rights were abstractions, limited in their market appeal. Language help make the benefits concrete. In boosterish newspaper ads, the promoters called attention to the railroad's proximity, the prime frontage created by new streets, and such romantic assets as "that beautiful piece of ground called Liberty Grove," available whole or in parcels. Land values decreased further from town. To counteract this disadvantage, the investors lured boarding schools and a silk mill, believing (correctly) that these institutions would serve as magnets for other buyers. Finally, the new district must appear solid – a material presence rather than a legal construct. As Price wrote in mid 1836, "I think it would invite to the purchase of our lots…if all the owners would lay open the streets and fence off all the inner lots, so it could be seen where they lie, and indicate the town plot; and simultaneously trees might be planted. I think we should make some money by the expenditure and help to draw the town in this direction."[510]

---

[508] [EKP], *Address Delivered at the Corner-Stone Laying of the Preston Retreat,* 8.
[509] Harper, chap. 53.
[510] Ibid.; EKP to David Townsend, 10 July 1836, doc. L16322, Letter Coll., CCHS.

Although the Matlack investors' strategy resembled the operations of a land company, they had retained a traditional partnership business model. Requirements at The Woodlands were different. More capital was at stake, more investors were needed, and John Elkinton had proven Philadelphians would accept cemetery stock. Accordingly, Thomas Mitchell and his advisors moved forward with plans for a joint-stock company like the one that ran Monument Cemetery. Eli Price drafted the act of incorporation, and it passed the state legislature on 13 April 1840.[511]

There was little unusual about Woodlands Cemetery's charter. The critiques of urban burial, the concern for survivors' feelings, and the promises to protect families "in their last resting place" all echoed laws that brought Laurel Hill and Monument cemeteries into being. What made the document distinctive was its neat inversion of another genre: the conventional developer's broadside. Instead of street frontage, buyers would receive shelter from invading streets. Laurel Hill had offered this, but Woodlands' promoters went further: instead of bold growth predictions (familiar from Matlack farm), they offered preservation of the estate's "beautiful landscape and scenery" as their principal raison d'être. Only one clue survived to the projectors' professions. Created through a charge on lot sales, the "perpetual fund" for cemetery improvements would be invested in ground rents or mortgages.[512]

Two tiers of administrators would operate the company. A group of "corporators" provided general oversight, their ranks filled initially by cemetery backers but in the long run by owners of grave lots. Routine business fell to seven managers. Elected annually from among the corporators, they had more direct control of the company's affairs and for most purposes constituted its leadership. According to the charter, members of either body had the power to purchase up to seventy-five acres of the Woodlands estate for cemetery use. This feat sounded simple in writing but it proved difficult in reality. The largest impediment and officially the only one was an outstanding mortgage for $15,000. Without clear title, it would be hard for Mitchell to sell his property and harder to attract investors. Worse yet, Mitchell's claim was divided. Although Thomas Kittera had died in 1839, his executrix now held his three-eighths of The Woodlands, and Eli Price may have had a stake, too.[513]

Hastily, Mitchell made arrangements to buy back Kittera's share. Along with fellow investors, he planned to split profits from the cemetery into thirty equal parts, treating the accompanying scrip as company stock. But there was an intermediate step. Lending bureaucratic weight to their project, the group elected to place Mitchell's

---

[511] *The Charter, By-Laws and Regulations of the Woodlands Cemetery Company* (Philadelphia: T. & G. Town, pr., 1845), 2-4; "The Cemeteries of Philadelphia. – Woodlands Cemetery."

[512] *Charter, By-Laws and Regulations of the Woodlands Cemetery Company* (1845 ed.), 2-4

[513] Ibid., 2-3; *Reports Relative to the Woodlands Cemetery* (Philadelphia: C. Alexander, pr., 1843), 4, 7; Kittera's Estate, 17 Pa. 416 (Sup. Ct. Penna. 1851); "Grant of Authority to Trustees to Convey, and to take Certificates – from the Woodlands Cemetery Company to the Equitable Owners in payment of their interest in the lands," [no day] July 1840, WCCC. This last document is signed by Ann Kittera, Thomas Mitchell, and Eli Price as "Equitable proprietors in the Woodlands Estate." The agreement may never have gone into effect but it points to an otherwise unrecorded division of interests by this time.

property in the hands of four trustees; these men, including Price and Mitchell himself, would then transfer title to the company. Strangely, the legal instruments that established this trust made no mention of the cemetery. Perhaps the omission insured progress in case of further title problems, for on 1 August 1840, the trustees, not the company, issued the thirty certificates.[514]

The Woodlands estate's trustees were now de facto developers. With the cemetery plan on hold, it was their job to see that subdivision occurred and profits were distributed, regardless of what came next. Gone was the sentimental language of the charter. The trustees' assignment sounded instead like a stock-holder driven version of the Matlack farm scenario. Mitchell, Price, and two other lawyers were obliged to divide the property "into Lots Parts and Parcels with such ways Passages and Streets as they may see fit and bargain sell and dispose of the same by public sales or private contracts for the greatest and best prices that can or may be reasonably had and gotten for the same."[515] Mitchell retained considerable power. Not only was he a trustee, he had also received eleven of the profit shares as compensation for his title. But being a shareholder differed from being sole proprietor. It thrust Mitchell into a web of interests that were professional, familial, and religious in nature.

Medium-sized capital campaigns still had a clannish quality in 1840. Even large corporations often operated under partnerships based on kinship, marriage, or other personal connections, so it was unsurprising that similar bonds joined Woodlands Cemetery corporators and estate shareholders (who were often one and the same).[516] The densest cluster of affiliations surrounded the Mitchell family. Thomas Mitchell was a sixty-year-old conveyancer; he was also a member of St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, the husband of Maria M. Cowell, and the father of two sons in related occupations. These ties placed Mitchell at the heart of the cemetery venture. They made him the brother-in-law of dry goods merchant John V. Cowell, now a shareholder and a corporator. They made him a more distant in-law of Andrew D. Cash, a former business partner and now an ally in the same way as Cowell. They made him the father of Benjamin and John Mitchell, one a conveyancer, the other a lawyer, and both committed to the project in the usual ways. Finally, the familial web encompassed merchant Henry Austie and clergyman Stephen Tyng. Both held a stake in the cemetery, both seem to have been Mitchell's in-laws, and both were ultimately buried next to him in a large Woodlands plot.[517]

The Price family formed another important node. Eli and his brother Philip were at once part of Thomas Mitchell's world and slightly outside it. Although both Prices were capable conveyancers and land speculators, they identified themselves primarily as specialists in the related fields of law and surveying, respectively. Eli's work put

---

[514]Deed Books G.W.C. v. 29, p. 53, G.S. v. 28, pp. 149, 151, 154; "Plan of Conveyancing &c. in respect to the Woodlands;" Managers Minutes, 13 July 1840.
[515] Deed Book G.S., v.28, p. 149.
[516] Howe, 98, 102, 104-105.
[517] *Reports Relative to the Woodlands Cemetery*, 4-5; Cowell, 406; *American National Biography* (online), s.v. "Tyng, Stephen Higginson;" Philadelphia city directories, 1825-1845; WCC lot index (Sec. F, lots 332-339). See also Appendix in this report.

the duo in direct contact with such title-law specialists as Garrick Mallery (Woodlands corporator, shareholder, and trustee) and Joseph B. Townsend, yet another member of that West Chester clan, who studied under Eli Price before becoming a corporator. Surveying led more toward city planning and municipal government. Significantly, both Philip Price and Andrew Cash helped oversee Philadelphia's northern expansion.[518]

Finally, it was wealth and prestige as much as professional connections that surrounded the Lexes and Ingersolls. The colorful lawyer-statesmen brothers Charles J. and Joseph R. Ingersoll famously stood on opposite sides of the political aisle, but they were united as Woodlands shareholders. Charles, despite his Democratic opposition to expanded corporate powers, was among the original corporators. Joseph would soon provide the company with legal counsel; he was also the brother-in-law of merchant Benjamin C. Wilcocks, an early shareholder and later the company president. The Lex brothers came from a different demographic. German Lutherans by birth, they still moved comfortably in Philadelphia's upper social and financial circles. Jacob had made his fortune in sugar refining. Charles F., a former bank director, now listed himself as "gent." in city directories.[519]

It is hard to tell what role religion, or rather church affiliation, played in these social networks. For instance, while the Mitchells, Joseph Ingersoll, and Stephen Tyng were all Episcopalians, they were Episcopalians of a different stripe. Joseph Ingersoll was a warden of St. Peter's, a bastion of urbane gentility. Tyng was fiery evangelical preacher, soon to be outspoken in his anti-Catholic views; as one biographer put it, "broad churchman was just as obnoxious to him as high churchman, and he fought both tooth and nail."[520] The Prices were somewhere in between. Born into the Society of Friends, they maintained close ties to that sect but drifted from its theology. Both men married out of meeting and ultimately received Episcopalian funerals, a turn suggestive of broader shifts within the Philadelphia establishment. The only direct connection ran between Tyng and the Mitchells. The latter belonged to St. Paul's, known as "Tyng's theater" when he presided there. Although Tyng had moved on to the Church of the Epiphany by 1840, he remained an important force in the Mitchells' lives and an indirect influence on their joint venture.[521]

---

[518] Eli and Philip Price obituaries, clipping files, CCHS; *Biographical Encyclopædia of Pennsylvania of the Nineteenth Century* (Philadelphia: Galaxy Pub. Co., 1874), s.v. "Townsend, Joseph B." and "Cash, Andrew D.;" Scharf and Westcott, 1: 662; Brewster, 9, 30.

[519] *Memoirs and Auto-Biography of Some of the Wealthy Citizens of Philadelphia: with a Fair Estimate of Their Estates – Founded upon a Knowledge of the Facts* (Philadelphia: n.p., 1846), 32, 37, 38, 68; *Dictionary of American Biography*, s.v. "Ingersoll, Charles Jared;" Baltzell, 133-135, 139.

[520] *Dictionary of American Biography,* s.v. "Tyng, Stephen Higginson." Tyng's "low church" orientation marked him as an evangelist and may have had political implications as well. On the semantic nuances of "high," "low," and "broad" church in nineteenth-century Philadelphia, see Jonathan Fairbanks, "John Notman: Church Architect," MA thesis, University of Delaware (1961), 50-51, 62.

[521] *Biographical Encyclopædia of Pennsylvania,* s.v. "Ingersoll, Joseph R.;" [EKP], *Centennial Meeting of the Descendants,* 39-42; Eli and Philip Price obituaries, clipping files, CCHS; Elizabeth M. Geffen, "Industrial Development and Social Crisis, 1841-1854" and Nathaniel Burt and Wallace E. Davies, "The Iron Age, 1876-1905" in Weigley, ed., *Philadelphia: A 300-Year History*, 356, 494; Baltzell, 182, 240-249.

The capital shortage persisted. Dividing interests in The Woodlands into shares was a first step but it left key problems unsolved. Failure to convey the property to the cemetery company deprived this stock offering of state sanction. Its success depended instead on the trustees' personal reputations and promotional abilities, as seen in Sidney George Fisher's encounter with Thomas Mitchell. The nation's lingering financial doldrums made matters worse. A corporate seal would boost public confidence but the same old paradox stood in the way: without paying off the mortgage there could be no clear title, and without a clear title there could be no "company" stock. Meanwhile, the four trustees made do with the funds they had; many early expenses came out of their own pockets.

Within months, the project started to languish. The company's board, which met regularly after incorporation, abandoned this futile exercise in the fall of 1840, leaving the trustees in charge for the next two years. Finally, on 21 January 1843, Thomas Mitchell sent a guardedly hopeful memorandum to his colleagues:

> Gentlemen
>
> I need scarcely say that since our last meeting the times have been and still are most unpropitious to all enterprise [;] amidst great discouragements, I have exerted myself to the uttermost to interest the public and bring the matter of the Cemetery into notice and have the pleasure to say I have been encouraged from a quarter originally unexpected. A plan has been suggested of dividing the whole concern into Six hundred Shares – 250 Dollars each and to offer a limited number to individuals and for Churches on the terms set forth in the prospectus herewith presented. About fifty shares are subscribed by individuals in their own behalf. The project is now before almost all the Churches – most of them are anxious to avail themselves of the advantages offered but are prevented owing to the pecuniary difficulties – tho' most of them could sell Lots to their respective members to the whole amounts if not much more than the purchase money. I would respectfully suggest the policy of making arrangements to that end with respectable Churches even if they may bid little or even nothing on hand – and to entheuse [sic] the managers to complete the purchase of the Cemetery, cause a conveyance thereof to this Corporation and to do all other matters and things that may be necessary to complete the concern….[522]

Mitchell was proposing new financial foundations for the cemetery. His plan seems to have originated with Eli Price, and, as refined in committee over the next few months, it did much to break the deadlock. Instead of thirty shares, there would be 600. Each had a par value of $250 and would entitle the bearer to 1,000 square feet of ground and 1/600th of company profits from ordinary lot sales. Individual investors would still be crucial. Now, however, churches would constitute key allies.

[522] Thomas Mitchell, "Commemoration" to WCC promoters, 21 January 1843, WCCC.

Buying shares in bulk, they would bring ready cash to the company, help spread risk, and confer the respectability to which Mitchell alluded.[523]

Until recently, urban churches had regarded rural cemeteries with skepticism, even hostility. Secular, extramural burial was a major break from tradition. It also introduced competition for fees that might otherwise have gone to church sextons. Laurel Hill helped dismantle these barriers. By 1840, clergymen were buying lots for themselves there, and one church, St. John's Lutheran Evangelical, had even purchased a plot for its members. However, the idea of raising start-up capital by selling wholesale to churches was more radical. Here, the example came from New York's Greenwood Cemetery, a non-profit institution that had struggled into existence after abandoning its joint-stock charter. Woodlands' proprietors were testing the limits of social acceptability.[524]

In another sense, though, their strategy was tried and true. Cemeteries were not the only models familiar to Woodlands' founders. The use of institutional partners to spread risk and confer prestige was a standard tool of residential development, familiar to Price from Matlack farm and presumably from other subdivisions. Nor were such techniques peculiar to the Philadelphia area. Near Boston, churches and schools were catalysts of suburbanization, opening what historian Henry Binford calls an "umbrella of domesticity" over the middle-class neighborhoods developers planned around them.[525] The Woodlands scheme, then, was novel in two ways. First, it brought residential planning techniques together with a for-profit cemetery company. Second, the engineers of this plan articulated it with striking precision and speculative gusto. For $500 (a twenty-percent down payment), a church could obtain ten stock shares and the attendant 10,000 square feet of ground. The same church then had four years in which to pay off the remainder of the purchase price, and while interest would be charged on the debt, those fees and the debt itself would be more than offset by profits from retail lot sales. This, at least, was the theory. As the de facto prospectus enthusiastically predicted: "Speedy profit on ten shares, or sale of 10,000 square feet – $2,000."[526]

---

[523] The "prospectus" accompanying Mitchell's letter may well have been Eli K. Price's "Outline or Scheme of the Woodlands Cemetery Compy." That undated document sets forth the mechanics of the 600-share system and so is a precursor to Sections IV and V in *Reports Relative to the Woodlands Cemetery.* The first references to wholesale arrangements with churches appears more than two years earlier in Managers Minutes, 1 September 1840, and "Plan of Conveyancing &c. in respect to the Woodlands." In this context, it is worth noting that undertaker William H. Moore, an original corporator, had recently been among the founders of a small, nominally Episcopalian "rural" cemetery in nearby Frankford. See *Franklin Cemetery* (n.p., [1839]) and Scharf and Westcott, 3: 2359-2360.

[524] John F. Watson, *Annals of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania in the Olden Time* (Philadelphia: Edwin S. Stuart, 1891), 3: 138; Sloane, 24, 59; Schuyler, "Evolution of the Anglo-American Rural Cemetery," 291-292; Wunsch, "Laurel Hill Cemetery," 28-29; cemetery-related TMs transcriptions from MS diaries of Philip Hone (5/21/1840) and George Templeton Strong (5/23/1840), and from "Greenwood Cemetery," *New-York Mirror* 18 (26 September 1840): 111, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. I am grateful to Dell Upton for supplying me with photocopies of these excerpts.

[525] Henry C. Binford, *The First Suburbs: Residential Communities on the Boston Periphery, 1815 – 1860* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 167-179.

[526] *Reports Relative to the Woodlands Cemetery,* 8-10.

Things would not go this smoothly. Economic stagnation and clerical unease counterweighed corporate optimism and generous terms. Still, the financial scheme performed its short-term function admirably. In the spring of 1843, mortgage-holder Peter Bousquet agreed to an extended payment plan. Title then passed from trustees to company, and 600 shares were issued under that newly revived body's authority.[527]

Communities, Commodities, and the Picturesque

In the early 1840s, Philip Price stood on shifting terrain. As the brother of Eli, a pillar of civic respectability, he had lived less conventionally, traveling outside Philadelphia's physical and social bounds. As a surveyor, he agreed to lay out Woodlands Cemetery, only to have his charges challenged and his professional competence impugned. And as the fulcrum between Woodlands Cemetery's business ethos and the transcendent values that managers wished their landscape to express, he was forced to straddle between roles that ultimately proved incompatible.

Price's appointment as cemetery surveyor commenced on July 13[3h], 1840. The step was a formality because his duties had started the previous fall and had made him a trusted advisor. Before coming to The Woodlands, he had worked at Laurel Hill and Monument cemeteries, translating their plans into ground measurements and, perhaps, playing a design role as well. These accomplishments were a source of pride. They were also important credentials: after Thomas Mitchell tapped his first two partners, Price had become their consultant and had performed preliminary surveys. But the official appointment came with new responsibilities. Now, Price joined his brother and Thomas Mitchell on a committee whose mission was "to view Mount Auburn Cemetery" and "to procure such plans as may be of service in laying out the Woodlands Cemetery." The idea was to study a new type at its birthplace. However, at age thirty-eight, Philip Price had a wider range of experience on which to draw.[528]

The youngest of ten siblings, Philip had attended the Westtown boarding school, which his parents helped manage, before proceeding to Philadelphia to study medicine. His career paralleled Eli's up to this point but Philip had extra-professional aspirations. Like many elite Philadelphians with Quaker backgrounds and scientific training, he believed strongly in social reform and the power of progressive

---

[527] Agreement of the Shareholders of Woodlands Cemetery, 25 March 1843 (recorded 8 Dec 1845), WCCC; Agreement between Peter Bousquet and WCC, 4 May 1843; Deed Book R.L.L. v. 37, p. 139 and following; Managers Minutes, 4 February, 22 April, 6 May 1843, 1 July 1843.

[528] Managers Minutes, 13 July 1840, 25 February 1843; "The Cemeteries of Philadelphia. – Woodlands Cemetery." The extent of Philip Price's involvement in Philadelphia's other rural cemeteries is unclear. In his February, 1843 report to the WCC, he referred to "the practical experience I had obtained in designing and laying out the Laurel Hill and Monument Cemeteries" (see fn. 33), but in a subsequent letter he omitted the word "designing" in a similar passage (see PMP to WCC, 30 December 1843, WCCC). Some of the confusion stems from the ambiguous division of labor in this pre-professional era of landscape architecture. In any case, Price and his surveyor partner Joseph Fox show up on "Statement of cost of Real Estate and improvements at Laurel Hill Cemetery from Feb. 26, 1836 to Feb 26, 1837…," MS, Laurel Hill Cemetery Company Coll., and Fox is named as surveyor on *Plan of the Monument Cemetery of Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: Lehman and Duval, lithographers, 1838).

education. These ideals drew him toward Robert Owen's socialism and to New Harmony, Indiana, where Owen's "utopian" experiment was underway.[529] Philip arrived in mid 1825, ready to practice medicine. His eldest brother, William, also a doctor, followed several months later, while Eli, who had attended Owen's Philadelphia presentations, grew increasingly skeptical. At first, Philip remained steadfast. Pained by his parents' disapproval, he nonetheless wrote to Eli, "On this subject thee may perceive I am an enthusiast, but I am perfectly persuaded that the system of mutual cooperation in labor will at no distant period become the prevailing system of society; and I hope that our family will as soon as possible embrace it for their mutual interest and happiness."[530] By the following summer, this optimism was gone. Although he had taught at New Harmony's boarding school and married Matilda Greentree in a double wedding ceremony, Philip grew disillusioned with the community's governance and left in the summer of 1826.

New Harmony might have seemed a complete loss were it not for a brief postscript. Before heading east, Philip and Matilda spent several months at the English Prairie, a Quaker-influenced agricultural compound in nearby Wanborough, Illinois. Here, English émigré Morris Birkbeck had settled eight years earlier, determined to explore the republican and communitarian possibilities of scientific farming. Birkbeck died in 1825 but his two sons retained some of his idealism. Now a splinter group from New Harmony joined them, "hoping to carry the social system into effect on a more limited scale."[531] Its members included the Price brothers, their families, and Robert Owen's architect, Stedman Whitwell, whose plans for a model town based on Owenite principles had gained wide recognition. Philip Price evidently admired Whitwell's work, referring to his unrealized buildings as "magnificent." But as Price ruminated on community, environment, and failure, his immediate surroundings left a deeper impression than any architect's vision. He wrote:

> It was upon entering this prairie after a fatiguing journey that I first became aware of the exquisite beauty and richness of these splendid gardens planted in the wilderness by the hand of Nature. This particular prairie is in extent about four or five miles square, and instead of being, as I imagined, a perfect plain without shrub or bush, [it] presented a surface undulating in the most graceful manner, with scarcely an acre of level ground, and clustered over

---

[529] The best source on Philip Price's time at New Harmony is Elliott, 283-285, 394-396, 489, 522, 1067-1078. Other books often confuse Philip with his brother William. Still of use are: *The Diaries of Donald MacDonald, 1824-1826* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1942), 208-209, 308-312, 334, illustrating how much interest Owen's ideas commanded among the Price brothers and their peers; George B. Lockwood, *The New Harmony Movement* (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1905), 104-105, 191-191, discussing Philip's role in the community's "constitutional convention" and his unusual wedding; William E. Wilson, *The Angel and the Serpent: The Story of New Harmony* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1964), 148-152, further analyzing the settlement's early government and Philip's part in it.

[530] PMP to EKP, 30 September 1825, as transcribed in Elliott, 1071.

[531] "Separate Appendix by My Uncle, Philip M. Price. Sunday: Aug. 1826," in Elliott, 1077. On the English Prairie or English Settlement, see also Elliott, 1069, and *American National Biography* (online), s.v. "Birkbeck, Morris," and "Flower, George."

> with groups of trees, affording the most grateful relief to the eye. The whole space appeared to be covered with flowers, of forms and tints most beautiful, and varied and disposed in a random and disordered manner that rendered this solitary display of the richness of Nature infinitely more attractive than the most studied parterre.[532]

If much of this language echoed contemporary Romantic prose, it was remarkable in other respects. Price saw in "Nature" the sort of horticultural variety that had become fashionable in English landscape gardening.[533] He particularly admired the location of the Birkbeck family's mansion, "situated on one of the swells of the Prarie…with no enclosures in the immediate vicinity." As important was the timing of this aesthetic revelation. The Wanborogh stay was a period of profound solace, an interval in which Price's still-strong communal yearnings seemed compatible with his Quaker upbringing and with the sort of pastoral "middle ground" that historian Leo Marx describes as existing "somewhere 'between," yet in transcendent relation to, the opposing forces of civilization and nature."[534] It did not last long. Money ran out and the group disbanded, leaving its members to re-enter the mainstream. By fall, Philip and Matilda Price had returned to Philadelphia.

Cemetery design came only gradually into Philip's Price's sphere of expertise. His immediate move was toward surveying and "improvements" in the broad nineteenth-century sense. Glossing over New Harmony, Eli later recalled of his brother: "He practiced his profession for a time; but to the exposure and labors of a country physician he preferred the office of Surveyor of Spring Garden, which he held for many years, and laid out the streets and made the plans of that district."[535] This was a different sort of community-building. Spring Garden lay on Philadelphia's fringe, stretching north and west of Franklin Square. When development picked up there in the late 1820s, Philip Price staked out a two-fold part in the process. His post as surveyor made him a municipal engineer, planning roads and infrastructure with his partner Joseph Fox. At the same time, the two men invested in local real estate, building on an urban framework they helped to create. Contemporaries apparently saw no conflict of interest. Fox and Price were reputable contractors, their skills in

---

[532] "Separate Appendix by My Uncle," in Elliott, 1077.

[533] On American uses of the heterogeneous style that became known as the Gardenesque, see Keith N. Morgan, "The Landscape Gardening of John Notman, 1810-1865," MA thesis, University of Delaware (1973), 31-37; Philip Pregill and Nancy Volkman, *Landscapes in History: Design and Planning in the Eastern and Western Traditions*, 2nd ed., (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1999), chap. 17. Pregill and Volkman group rural cemeteries with utopian communities in their discussion of "The Romantic Period." Evidence presented below should underscore the logic of this pairing.

[534] Leo Marx, *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), 23. See also Howe, 115-117, on this ideal's political context. The agricultural setting of Price's musings is significant because it sets his vision apart from the more fully domesticated and contemplative aesthetic applied to the Hudson River Valley in later decades; see Schuyler, "Sanctified Landscape," 99, 101.

[535] [EKP], *Centennial Meeting of the Descendants,* 41.

demand at other sites. Both ultimately worked on Laurel Hill and Monument cemeteries – a challenging departure from their usual routine.[536]

By 1840, America's rural cemetery movement had matured into a complex and regionally differentiated phenomenon. Mount Aubrun's dense groves drew more visitors than ever, its allure based, paradoxically, on maintaining a solemn, contemplative atmosphere that one early observer likened to "the bosom of a wilderness." On the other hand, so many cities and towns had produced their own versions of the type that critics now freely compared them. New design ideals emerged in the process. For instance, while winding walks and shady glens remained essential, greater openness might now be acceptable. It was these sorts of questions that Woodlands managers pondered as they planned their own grounds.[537]

Philip and Eli Price set off on their reconnaissance trip shortly after receiving authorization from the board. Although their assignment was to scrutinize Mount Auburn, they traveled also to nearby towns, visiting Worcester Rural Cemetery and Salem's Harmony Grove. All three sites seemed excessively picturesque. Roads were needlessly convoluted, topographical changes were abrupt, and Mount Auburn in particular appeared "shut in and obstructed by undergrowths of trees and bushes." This, at least, was the Prices' retrospective assessment. Unable to resist the invidious comparison, they observed "that while every part of the Woodlands is brought within convenient access from the avenues, they are not so multiplied as to become involved in a labyrinth…. In these particulars and its greater simplicity of plan we think it presents advantages over the Cemeteries visited by us at the East, while in openness of prospect and ever changing Views and beautiful groves it finds no parallel in the far famed Mount Auburn."[538] Behind this boosterism lay practical limitations. Remaking Hamilton's estate in Mount Auburn's image was not cost effective, and by the time of the Prices' report, the board had committed itself to a very different plan. But local taste and tradition were factors, too. Without them, the language of preservation might not have weighed in so heavily.

Sometime after touring Massachusetts, the Prices headed south to inspect Greenmount Cemetery near Baltimore. Greenmount was the only rural cemetery outside Philadelphia to rest on genteel, domestic foundations. Like Laurel Hill and The Woodlands, it had been "the country seat of former opulent proprietors" and as

---

[536] In Union Canal Co. v. Young et al., 1 Whart. 410 (Sup. Ct. Penna., Eastern District, 1836), Price is described as being the third person to serve as Spring Garden's surveyor. The witness added, "Joseph Fox is now Regulator with Mr. Price. They have been such seven or eight years." The case involved one of Fox and Price's Spring Garden real estate investments. For an overview of the neighborhood's development in these years, see J. Thibaut, "Historic Resource Study: Edgar Allan Poe National Historic Site, Independence National Historical Park, Philadelphia," TMs, 1981, part 1, chap. 2. I am grateful to the Park Service's Steven Medeiros for providing a copy of this document. For an impressionistic historical overview of Surveyors' and Regulators' duties in Philadelphia, see John Hill Martin, *Martin's Bench and Bar of Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: Rees Welsh & Co., 1883), 141-153. On the perceived compatibility of public and private interests at this time (at least among Whigs), see Howe, 98-99.

[537] A useful state-of-the-art report is [J. Brazer], "Rural Cemeteries," *North American Review* 53, no. 113 (October 1841): 385-412. The quotation is from Joseph Story's Mount Auburn dedication speech.

[538] EKP and PMP, report to WCC Managers, 17 February 1843, in Managers Minutes 25 February 1843.

such retained "many of the marks of their taste." The Prices noted these features approvingly but stood confident in their own site's advantages; history and panoramic views set it apart. Indeed, the idea that The Woodlands was sacred and unique became a sort of mantra, solemnly reiterated before the board. While rural cemeteries in general tended to preserve "open spaces" and "park scenery" from being "prostrated in the progress of building improvements," The Woodlands' spectacular viewshed, encompassing Philadelphia and environs, made it a special case. Maybe cemetery managers could appreciate this circumstance. Perhaps they could muster the "zeal and pride sufficient to rescue so much beautiful scenery from destruction and preserve it in its varied aspects for the gratification of our posterity."[539]

The Prices' imploring tone suggests real choices were at hand. In February of 1843, the cemetery company had just reorganized after a two-and-a-half-year hiatus and as yet held no property. Some purchase now loomed, but its extent and contours were unclear. What was to prevent prior development schemes from resurfacing? The cemetery was struggling and Thomas Mitchell remained skeptical. Ignoring official plans, he had not accompanied the Prices on their cemetery tour, and while much of their report was a straightforward travel account, other parts read as a not-so-veiled plea for forbearance. One passage warned against obstructing views. Another suggested that all land north of the riverside road go to cemetery use. And in a separate report, Philip Price used his surveyor's authority to condemn "Any encroachment upon this plot for the purpose of creating building lots."[540]

In these two documents, Woodlands Cemetery's board possessed the makings of a landscape doctrine. Stewardship was its hallmark, encapsulated in the words "our posterity," and though Romantic notions of nature and history underlay this call to action, the Prices stressed practicality instead. There was no need to re-create Mount Auburn' s dense foliage and gratuitous curves. Gentle slopes, small groves, and an "openness of prospect" were the site's assets. A simple ground plan would cast them to advantage without reducing ease of access or draining the company purse. But whatever the social and economic similarities, grave lots and building lots must not be confused. Rural cemeteries and urban improvements were rhetorically opposed. If the managers understood the distinction, they would enforce it through planning.

In retrospect, such formal declarations look like statements of company policy. At the time, however, no such consensus existed. The Prices' reports were assertions of *their* values, the voice of reform, restraint and genteel sensibilities, of Whiggish land *investment* over Jacksonian land *speculation*.[541] The board's new president, Edward Coles, probably stood on this side. A former governor of Illinois and an outspoken

---

[539] Ibid.; see also Long, "Woodlands," 201-203.
[540] PMP, report to WCC managers, 18 February 1843, in Managers Minutes, 25 February 1843.
[541] Howe, 101-113, especially 105; Schuyler, "Sanctified Landscape," 104-106; Rilling, 40, 42-43. For a review of recent literature on the idea of stewardship (stressing rural rather than urban origins) see Brian Donahue, "Environmental Stewardship and Decline in Old New England," *Journal of the Early Republic* 24, no. 2 (Summer 2004), 234-241. The details of Thomas Mitchell's biography are too scant to allow definitive typecasting but his writings suggest a Jacksonian Democratic outlook.

abolitionist, he knew the Birkbecks and may have met Philip Price at Wanborough.[542] Thomas Mitchell inclined in the other direction. For him, the cemetery was a utilitarian proposition, a fall-back strategy after his canal plan's failure. Yet it is easy to overstate this antagonism, at least in its early stages. Mitchell had tapped the Prices, and the three men's overlapping occupations supplied some common ideological ground. Rather than clashing directly, their varied and sometimes self-contradictory commitments made for long-term strains in the company.

Rural cemeteries had an ambivalent relationship with commerce. Formed in an era of rapid urbanization, they sought to counteract "the noisy press of business" with the "magnificence of nature."[543] This was hardly an anti-urban stance. The founders of these institutions were typically businessmen whose careers and social lives revolved around the city, and whose prosperity depended on its wellbeing. Nor was commerce itself the target. The same cemetery founders and many early lot-holders saw economic development as the very basis of social progress and moral growth; this was Eli Price's position.[544] Instead, it was "urban materialism" at which the rural cemetery took aim, along with worldly ambition in general. Such a cultural project could pose practical problems. Brooklyn's Greenwood had abandoned its joint-stock charter in order to appear strictly charitable. And while contemporary magazines sometimes supplied readers with cemeteries' sales figures, the idea was to stress these institutions' popularity and financial strength.[545] Only in Philadelphia had a for-profit pattern taken hold. At The Woodlands, the complex interplay of high ideals and economic imperatives proved especially hard to manage.

Some bounds for that relationship were laid down in the company's rules, first published in the spring of 1843. While most of these guidelines were unexceptional, several suggested the framers' close attention to rural cemetery trends and to the meaning of grave-lots-as-real-estate. Freestanding tombs had recently become controversial. Long a staple of New Orleans graveyards, they now struck some northern critics as ostentatious and unnatural, a kind of architectural embalming that threatened "rural character" itself.[546] Laurel Hill had banned above-ground "vaults" and other cemeteries had started to impose height limitations. Woodlands managers followed suit, setting eighteen inches as the threshold above which their approval was required. Other provisions addressed the grave lot's status as an investment. Lot owners might sell their property, but only with company approval. Charging for

---

[542] *American National Biography* (online), s.v. "Birkbeck, Morris;" *Dictionary of American Biography,* s. v. "Coles, Edward."

[543] Joseph Story, *An Address Delivered on the Dedication of the Cemetery at Mount Auburn, September 24, 1831* (Boston, 1831), 8, 12, as quoted in Thomas Bender, "The 'Rural' Cemetery Movement: Urban Travail and the Appeal of Nature," *New England Quarterly* 47 (June 1947): 198. Such juxtapositions are a fixture of rural cemetery literature; see, for example, [Brazer], 402. On the closely related contrast of home and marketplace in contemporary consolation literature, see Ann Douglas, "Heaven Our Home: Consolation Literature in the Northern United States, 1830-1880," in David E. Stannard, ed., *Death in America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1975), 49, 56.

[544] Howe, 101-103, 112; Harper, 388; Futhey and Cope, 697.

[545] Bender, 202, 204-205, 208; Sloane, 59, 129-131, 134; [Brazer], 391, 394, 399.

[546] [Brazer], 399-403.

interment in one's own lot was prohibited, thus shielding the company from an unwanted form of competition. At the same time, maintaining high land values was desirable, so the minimum resale price was set at twenty-five cents per square foot. Such dictates suggested that ground was the commodity in question. However, another rule stated otherwise. Acknowledging that real property could be forcibly sold to settle an owner's debts, the board allowed their deeds to convey "only the right of interment," itself incapable of seizure.[547]

Most burial lots would be rectangular, or nearly so. This was standard rural cemetery practice, and in Philadelphia, where riverfront land was expensive, the contortion of squarish lots to fit a small parcel's curving road system had become something of an art form. Serpentine roads were like pastoral rhetoric: they differentiated cemetery lots from building lots even as cultural and economic forces drew those two types together. Nowhere was this task more important than at The Woodlands. Real estate men knew the grid, but this particular subset understood the value of the curve.

Or did they? Philip Price was not sure. In late 1843, cemetery managers commenced an internal audit, hoping at long last to sort out company finances. As part of this project, they asked Price to explain the terms of his contract, the nature of his charges, and the details of all work performed to date.[548] The request struck him as an odd formality. He responded:

> There was not at any time any special contract or agreement as to the charge for the service, nor could there have been any from the nature of the duties, it being impossible to ascertain in advance the time and attention it would require…. Your grounds occupy a space of nearly eighty acres - and probably one third of the labor of laying out and plotting the whole, has already been performed - including the calculations of the areas of all the separate small lots, - which from the lines being curved must necessarily be very tedious. Considering the difficulties that have retarded the progress of the company, I am willing to take the whole amount now due me in cemetery shares at their present rate - and if it is the pleasure of the Board that I shall continue the survey, will accept compensation for all future services in the same way.[549]

This answer proved unsatisfactory. The board wanted a diagram of Price's lot surveys and a concrete cost estimate for the work that lay ahead. By the following spring they were pressing him again and now seeking bids from competitors.[550] The latter move came as a blow. Price wrote:

---

[547] *Reports Relative to the Woodlands Cemetery,* 11. On vaults, see also EKP, Report for 1852.
[548] Managers Minutes, 2 December 1843.
[549] PMP to WCC, 30 December 1843, WCCC.
[550] Managers Minutes, 30 December 1843, 13 February, 2 March 1844.

> The nature of the services required is such, that it is quite impossible to tell, in anticipation, what will be the whole cost. Very much depends upon the manner in which the lots shall be subdivided - whether the dividing lines shall be straight, or curved in accordance with the general plan of the grounds, and whether the subdivisions shall be into larger or smaller lots. In all similar undertakings in which I have been heretofore engaged, my services have been requested I presume from an impression of my competency to perform them to the advantage of the employers - and with an implied reliance that I would not make an exorbitant charge when the business was completed, and I do not know of any other footing upon which such an undertaking could well be placed. And as so much of the beauty of the grounds depends on a judicious and tasteful plan of laying them out, and so much future difficulty is absorbed by having the survey made with great care and accuracy, I cannot, with a proper self respect, think of being brought into competition for the lowest bid, without regard to other qualifications.[551]

Surveying was an established profession in the early 1840s, but landscape architecture was not. Price understood that he practiced a novel and difficult branch of his field – one that, in his mind at least, required flexibility and indulgence. At the same time, his self-defense may be more interesting for what it lacked. Unlike contemporary architects, whose struggle for professional legitimacy was well advanced, Price laid little claim to arcane knowledge or unusually refined sensibilities.[552] After a passing reference to taste, his language parallels that of a skilled builder, proud of his trade and still bound by its aspirations. Equally significant was his reluctance to philosophize on the nature of his task. Although his 1820s writings showed him capable of discussing landscape in highly aesthetic terms, he remained cautiously utilitarian before the board. His plan was in place; it resembled his other successful projects; the curves needed no justification.

Woodlands managers thought otherwise. Price wanted $1250 for his completed work and was willing to take it in stock. But his inability to supply hard criteria for assessing his charges along with his evasions about future costs exasperated the board. With a competing bid in hand, they followed up a suggestion that Price himself had grudgingly advanced. Three other surveyors would examine his accounts, one named by him, one by the board, and one chosen by the other two. That third arbiter's judgment would then settle the dispute conclusively.[553]

It was at this point that the trajectory of Price's professional ordeal intersected with the broad arc of company business strategy. For months, churches had figured

---

[551] PMP to WCC, 8 March 1844, WCCC.
[552] Dell Upton, "Pattern Books and Professionalism: Aspects of the Transformation of Domestic Architecture in America, 1800-1860," *Winterthur Portfolio* 19, nos. 2-3 (Summer-Autumn 1984): 107-150.
[553] Managers Minutes, 9, 23 March 1844.

centrally in managers' marketing plans. Those plans advanced when Thomas Mitchell's son, Benjamin, subscribed for ten stock shares on behalf of St. Paul's in the fall of 1843. Another evangelical Episcopal congregation soon followed suit, and by the following June, the Rev. Stephen H. Tyng had agreed to do the same for his Church of the Epiphany. As stockholders made these nominal commitments, cemetery managers pressed Price to lay out the "church allotments." His payment would be "seventy five dollars…in full of all services as surveyor and draughtsman," and the result was a grid with curvilinear borders, soon called Section C.[554] The church section was Price's last project for the company. He must have made his intentions clear before any peer review could occur, because in mid summer managers asked him to record all his Woodlands surveys on a map legible to successors. His departure created a dilemma: how could surveying proceed while, technically at least, the ongoing investigation of his charges precluded a clean break? Edward D. Roberts was Price's assistant and possibly part of his extended family. Soon he assumed the lead role, allowing a relatively smooth transition.[555]

Although the surveyor controversy subsided, surveying itself remained a symbolically charged arena, and it was with churchmen that the next rift opened. Section C was large enough to hold the St. Paul's and Epiphany allotments. That left St. Andrew's to find room on the other side of Magnolia Avenue, immediately to the north. John Pechin was the congregation's representative. A former vestryman of St. Paul's, he would have known Tyng and the Mitchells personally, and his support boosted Woodlands' chances of tapping the largest Episcopal congregations in Philadelphia.[556] The problem was in the details. Church allotments were strange hybrids, spaces one institution staked out in another, and though cemetery managers claimed churches were free to design these plots themselves, the question of compatibility stood open. St. Andrew's presented its plan in mid 1844 and received preliminary approval. By October, however, managers had rethought this decision in light of a proposal from Garrick Mallery. While the congregation wanted a winding path as its eastern boarder, Mallery wanted a straight one, believing it better suited to "the adjoining lots and the descent of the ground."[557] Pechin wrote back in opposition:

> With some care I have examined the plans on paper and also the walks and carriage ways as laid out upon the grounds. It appears to me that there could have been more variety as well as beauty in laying out the entire plan. With the exception of the carriage-ways and a few circles, very judiciously made to save some valuable

[554] Managers Minutes, 7 October, 2 December 1843, 23 March, 13 April, 22 June 1844.
[555] Managers Minutes, 9 July, 12, 27 September 1844. Price treated Roberts as a protégé even after the split, demanding the company pay his overdue bills (PMP to Benjamin C. Wilcocks, 11 September 1844, WCC). In 1850, the U.S. Census showed the twenty-nine-year-old Roberts living with Price's family.
[556] *Memoirs and Auto-Biography of Some of the Wealthy Citizens of Philadelphia*, 49. When Grace Church joined the list of likely subscribers in 1845, Woodlands Cemetery had ties to Philadelphia's largest Episcopal congregations; see Deborah Mathias Gough, *Christ Church, Philadelphia: The Nation's Church in a Changing City* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995), 228.
[557] Managers Minutes, 12 October 1844; see also 2 December 1843, 10 August 1844.

> trees, the walks as yet laid out present an uniform sameness of straight lines, crossing each other nearly at right angles; and consequently affording less variety than is to be found in several of the most admired Cemeteries of our Country. In laying out other allotments in your grounds, they must necessarily be made in keeping with those already made in order to exhibit a proper symmetry in the whole plan. As it regards the serpentine walk in question, although it does not appear to be in exact keeping with those immediately around it, it does however form a variety, not unusual in some other cemeteries, presenting a number of prominent parts of circles which suit the fancy of many individuals. It has been found that such locations have a very decided preference over those which are not so strikingly prominent…. With some Members of your board (as far as I have ascertained) it does not seem to be a matter of much importance whether the walk, as laid out, should remain crooked, or be made straight. As it regards my own opinion, it is worth very little; and would be of no manner of importance but for the relation which I sustain to the Church, the interests of which I am permitted to represent.[558]

An unflattering comparison with competitors left the managers unfazed. They voted three-to-one in favor of Mallery but, in a token concession, agreed to place Pechin's letter on the record. It was an important precedent, set without comment. Little surprise that St. Andrew's abandoned their allotment several years later.[559] More puzzling was the managers' decision to preserve Pechin's letter. As they surely saw, the document represented an indictment of their institution's aesthetic, an assertion that linear utility had trumped curvilinear beauty. Like Philip Price, Pechin felt no need to explain why "parts of circles" were beautiful. He merely reiterated a popular view and claimed other cemeteries had done more to accommodate it. Whatever the weight of such charges, the argument linked picturesque variety to generous motives in a way that would have confounded an earlier generation. That Pechin assumed the connection testified to the cultural inroads it had made.

Landscape was only one sphere in which managers considered the relationship between institutional form and public perception. The nature of their project forced them repeatedly to confront analogous problems as new sets of interests emerged. More than surveying, it was the company's financial structure that consistently generated friction. In conventional business practice, a stockholder's voting power was tied to his investment: the more shares he owned, the more votes he could cast. But when one Woodlands corporator suggested adopting this arrangement, it caused a stir. Would the cemetery abide by such rules? Would wealth be the de facto basis of influence in this newly formed body? Eli Price did not think so. Reporting on behalf of a committee assigned to consider the question, he opined:

---

[558] John C. Pechin to WCC Managers, 17 October 1844, WCCC.
[559] Managers Minutes, 26 October 1844; Vestrymen of St. Andrew's Church to WCC Managers, 2 March 1852, WCCC.

> This is not like a moneyed institution where mere ownership of shares constitutes a membership of the Corporation nor is it a necessary qualification to becoming a member. Some of those constituted members by the Legislature are not share holders nor need anyone hereafter elected be a shareholder…Our Corporation seems to have in view ostensibly an object of humanity and certainly may as well be classed as charitable, as the Philadelphia Savings Institution was by our Supreme Court, from its purpose of receiving the deposites [sic] of the poor.[560]

Whatever the analogy's merit, Price's many qualifications betrayed his misgivings. The board accepted his argument, but his technical cautions against violating the charter may have carried more weight than his moral philosophy. Nor was this the end of such controversies. No sooner had the voting rights quandary been resolved than a certain group of stockholders began pushing to dissolve their one tangible asset – their ground claims – into the general pool of property from which company profits would arise. Instead of land and dividends, they would receive dividends alone, increasing these by dumping their claims back on the company for retail sale. This proposal had the potential to wreak havoc. It broke "faith" with the intentions of the prospectus and, in addition to bookkeeping problems, promised to create a class of short-term profiteers. Again, Price took the broad view:

> The true interest of the whole concern requires exactly what was contemplated at the time of adopting the report [or prospectus], that there should be sales of shares and sales of lots; …and the activity of all, – those stimulated by an exclusive interest as well as those governed by the general interest, would equally promote the establishment of the Cemetery, and in the results, the interest of the whole would be advanced. In the burial of the dead – such is the force of relationship and other attractions, that one can hardly be buried without drawing a family, nor a family without attracting other families. So that no one can operate for himself without promoting the general good.[561]

But those pushing to claim their ground as "money" were not interested in family values. They were investors first and foremost, and no matter how deftly Price wove together the rhetoric of Adam Smith and *Godey's Lady's Book*, they were not about to change their minds. After an eight-month standoff, Thomas Mitchell proposed a solution: those stockholders still hoping to claim ground might do so whenever they wanted. However, they would not receive dividends from the company's retail sales until other shareholders had taken the equivalent amount in either ground *or dividends*; at this point all investors could start from an equal footing. Could such a

---

[560] Corporators Minutes, 24 October 1843.
[561] "Proceedings of Stockholders – November 1843," MS removed from Managers Minutes, WCCC.

plan move forward under the cemetery's charter? In a lengthy disquisition, eminent jurist Joseph Ingersoll opined that it could. Eli Price was gently overruled.[562]

With each such confrontation, the line separating Woodlands Cemetery from other kinds of businesses came back into question. What made rural cemeteries distinctive if not the collective spirit and family orientation to which Price alluded? Perhaps it was landscape, despite Pechin's objections. Or maybe it was remoteness, saving urbanites from miasmas and the scourge of tainted water. From the start of the cemetery movement, public health had been a driving concern. By the 1840s, however, that concern had tipped toward hysteria after several English sanitary reformers published shocking exposés. One of these was Edwin Chadwick's *Supplementary Report…on the Results of a Special Enquiry into the Practice of Interment in Towns*. Appearing in 1843, it boosted already high anxieties and was soon circulating on both sides of the Atlantic.[563] But anxiety could be useful. When, at long last, Woodlands Cemetery prepared to open for business, managers agreed that publishing extracts from Chadwick's report would be a boon to their project. Eli Price performed the necessary editing, and by late January of 1845, the pamphlet was ready for distribution. Some 175 copies went to Philadelphia bookseller John W. Moore for general sale. Two weeks later, every member of the state legislature received his own copy, along with a bill proposing to ban burials in Philadelphia and certain adjoining districts after January 1, 1860.[564]

The pamphlet drive was part of a broader public relations campaign that took shape in the same period. Determined to persuade the legislature, the cemetery hired a reporter to attend a lecture at Jefferson Medical College on the evils of intramural burial. When the resulting article appeared, 150 copies of the newspaper were sent to Harrisburg, compliments of the company.[565] These sorts of tactics recalled those used in the battle over Mitchell's canal. Again, the rhetoric of public good featured prominently, and again that ideal became a slippery abstraction. Cemetery managers wished to prove that urban burial was not only unsanitary but also mercenary. Thus their executive committee prepared a memorial for the legislature that proclaimed:

> The experience of older cities…abundantly proves how offensive and poisonous are the exhalations of the putrefying dead in the midst of a dense living population, and how insecure are the interred remains of the deceased from the cupidity of those who profit by the frequent repetition of burials within the limited spaces allotted for them. The steady march of building improvement[s], to meet the requirements of business and of convenient residences, also frequently encroach upon the graveyards of the city, and

---

[562] Managers Minutes, 9 July, 16 August 1844.
[563] Julie Rugg thoughtfully reevaluates the report's English reception in "Cemetery Establishment in Britain," 113-115; see also her "Researching Early-Nineteenth-Century Cemeteries," 133, 136-37; Schuyler, "Evolution of the Anglo-American Rural Cemetery," 292-293; Torchia, 13.
[564] Wilcocks, Report for 1844; Managers Minutes, 15 January 1845; Executive Committee Minutes, 23, 25 January, 6 February 1845.
[565] Executive Committee Minutes, 29 January 1845.

> human bones are disturbed to prepare building foundations. Warned by the lessons of history, it is the part of a wise foresight and true philanthropy to avert the evil by preventive remedy, rather than to leave it 'till grown inveterate by time and habit for other generations to eradicate.[566]

The flaw or maybe the genius of this argument stemmed from a kind of triangulation. If greed was what kept urban graveyards in operation despite all their disadvantages, there must be something inherently altruistic or philanthropic about rural cemeteries. Whether the latter would also make money was not at issue. Instead, the choice pitted two kinds of profiteers – the graveyard owner and the house builder – against anonymous defenders of nature, history, and public health. As the memorial's authors made clear, those citizens who signed their petition collectively envisioned a place "where abundant vegetation shall absorb and the free winds dissipate the noxious *effluvia* arising from decaying bodies; where the repose of the dead shall be undisturbed, and they may peaceably molder into kindred dust, – accessible and venerated relics, amid nature's beautiful and impressive groves, initiating the visitation of surviving friends and teaching salutary lessons to the human heart."

Here was a utopia of sorts. The stress laid on sanitation, community, and the didactic value of relics was common to the rural cemetery movement as a whole. At Woodlands, however, this language assumed special meaning. Eli Price had stayed clear of New Harmony, but he wrote with unusual conviction about new environments' potential to strengthen social bonds. These bonds joined the dead to living. They did not threaten private property or conventional social arrangements, for their origins were domestic and their future lay in the family lot. Rather, the world Price constructed in his prose combined the landscape of an English Prarie with logistics of a Matlack farm and the reforms of a Preston Retreat. It was a compelling image and grew more so in each iteration. Repetition was necessary because those tensions present at the company's founding had not abated. For a time they actually intensified, and it was during this period that Price's powers of persuasion were needed most.

Two different audiences caught glimpses of his vision. Stockholders were one, and in their case it was crucial that picturesque burial real estate seem a promising long-term investment. Early earnings reports were disappointing. Part of the problem was a surplus of scrip: the abundance of Woodlands shares had driven down their market value, making it much cheaper to obtain burial lots through that means than through retail purchase. Another sore point was the churches. As of 1845, only Grace Church had acted on its agreement, prompting a new round of outreach efforts from the company.[567] Recent property improvements seemed to offer some hope. During the late 1840s, the mansion

---

[566] Undated memorial pasted in Executive Committee Minutes following entry of 20 September 1845.

[567] Thomas Mitchell to WCC Managers, 25 September [?] 1846, WCCC; Managers Minutes, 1 February, 1, 22 April 1845; Executive Committee Minutes, 1 July 1845; Leslie and EKP, Report for 1845. Publications resulting from the outreach campaign included *Statement of the Advantages and Inducements to Churches and Congregations in Becoming Shareholders in The Woodlands Cemetery Company,* [n.p., 1845], and *St. Andrew's Church Allotment, Woodlands Cemetery* (Philadelphia: Stavely and M'Calla, pr., 1846).

was repaired, trees planted and roads paved. Equally encouraging was the arrival of hallowed relics. If churches would not endow the grounds with a semi-religious atmosphere, the bodies of Commodore Porter and General Robinson might serve a similar purpose. But by 1849, there was fresh cause for concern. A wave of competition had swept through the city, leaving Woodlands to contend with such rivals as South Laurel Hill, Philadelphia, Glenwood, and American Mechanics' cemeteries, "besides some attached to Churches."[568] What would set Woodlands apart from these newcomers? Price pointed to the very assets and ideals he had defended all along. Nothing in Philadelphia compared with the Hamilton estate:

> Within its precincts are the lights and shadows of hills and vales, woods, park and lawn in ample space; the valley deepened and the hills elevated by the woods that crown the latter, whence through vistas are seen Church spires, _ bright and winding streams, and woodlands so distant as to be azure tinted, lending enchantment to the view. And though hushed is the "garden of graves," beneath its headlands floats a busy Commerce, its wings widely spread upon unseen hulls and moving as by the power of magic through green fields and sylvan scenes.[569]

This last image contained the core of Price's thesis. Beauty and business were not only compatible, they were so deeply entwined as to disguise each other before the uninformed. Sentiment and aesthetics might comprise a sort of superstructure, but they were profoundly consequential. As Price continued:

> To mere men of business these may seem to be fanciful attractions; yet are they truths and facts that will ever influence the hearts of those who are making a choice of a last resting place for the dead. The entire movement now so prevalent to seek a rural grave, – the funeral observances, – and future visitations to the tomb, are all but matters of feeling and fancy; and all idle and useless, as they think in some European cities, where all the dead are thrown in a common charnel house, and their identity and position instantly obliterated by quick lime and comminture of bones. It is then on the poetry and religious instincts of the human heart that we have made our investment, and it is in the superior attractiveness in the respects of taste and feeling that the Woodlands Cemetery is, and will more and more ever become, superior to all others, and though tardily, finally, more profitable than they.

It was an intricate argument, at once material and metaphysical, sociological and psychological. All strands came together near the end of the address as Price proclaimed:

---

[568] EKP, Report for 1849. On these new competitors, see also Scharf and Westcott, 2: 693, 3: 2360.
[569] EKP, Report for 1849.

> These pleasing external objects are realities, useful and practical realities, – and so are the feelings and sentiments they enkindle realities, leading to results morally and religiously useful to the Community, and moreover profitable to the owners. The tranquil scene and quiet retreat, – the somber shades beneath all the graves, or bright prospects in the distance, that attract the living of various mood, will cause them to wish there to repose and there to place their friends.

Shareholders were a select group. Price's other audience was far broader, including government officials and members of the public at large. Here, the rhetorical needs were different. Since tax exemption was the goal, the emphasis was on the cemetery's civic value rather than its entrepreneurial promise. In 1845, the General Assembly had failed to enact the proposed burial ban, leaving supporters to revive their crusade down the line. Meanwhile, a related cause took precedence. Woodlands managers had long hoped to gain tax-free status from the legislature.[570] Now that urban burial's perils had garnered public attention, the time seemed right for a concerted push. Again board members sent out extracts from Chadwick's report, this time attaching relevant legal citations. One such reference showed the state had exempted "all burial grounds of religious congregations" as long as they did not exceed five acres. This precedent would grow in symbolic importance. Although the legislature again denied the company's request, the stage was set for a protracted confrontation.[571]

For several more years, the cemetery's tax status remained ambiguous. Unable to meet annual payments, managers appealed to officials' sense of civic pride while suggesting some exemptions already applied.[572] Finally, in early 1851, a memorial to the legislature from Philadelphia's County Commissioners served as the catalyst. The commissioners proposed repealing recent laws sheltering most institutional property from taxation. Eli Price responded with a critical pamphlet and when the County Solicitor fired back, a surprisingly philosophical debate unfolded about role of institutions in public life.

Certain aspects of the exchange conformed to conventional political positions. Price argued, for instance, that "Schools and Churches, and Charitable Institutions…prevent crime and pauperism." When he proceeded to justify tax relief on the premise that "the cheapest mode of prevention of evil is that which encourages private effort and enterprise," he was expressing a core precept of contemporary Whig thought.[573] But

---

[570] See "Proceedings of Stockholders – November 1843;" Managers Minutes, 24 January 1844.
[571] The quotation is from EKP, John C. Mitchell and Charles E. Lex to members of the General Assembly, 18 March 1846, a letter transcribed in Executive Committee Minutes of same date. See also Managers Minutes, 6 January 1846; Leslie and EKP, Report for 1845; Lex and Lex, Report for 1846. As the last source makes clear, the bill passed the House of Representatives only to fail in the Senate. This partial victory came dearly. Company receipt books record payments totaling $242.49 to the law firm of Vogdes & Phillips for "Expenses in procuring the passage of a Law to Exempt the Woodlands Cemetery from Taxation" (see entries of 25 March and 29 April 1847).
[572] Jacob Lex to Benjamin H. Brewster, 5 October 1847, WCCC.
[573] EKP, *Taxation of Learning, Charity, and Religion* (Philadelphia: United States Steam Power Book and Job Printing Office, pr., 1851), 4; Howe, 98-99.

where did "charity" stop and "enterprise" begin? Here the debate grew convoluted. Both men spoke in broad generalities, ignoring inconvenient details that weakened their cases. Local rural cemeteries proved an especially vexing subject because, in discussing them, both sides found themselves struggling to define a new kind of corporation's place in their society. Since that corporation was officially secular yet vaguely religious, conceived as a business yet discussed as a charity, effectively urban yet rhetorically rural, and receiving the dead while tied emotionally and economically to the living, the battle to define it became a battle by analogy.

In Price's view, rural cemeteries were like churches, schools, and charities. Engines of social betterment, they deserved public support because they were doing the government's work.

> The great ends of all government for which taxes are levied is to preserve order, secure life, liberty, reputation and property, and to advance civilization, promote the happiness, and moral and religious elements of mankind. All these are more effectively secured and promoted by schools of learning, charitable relief, and moral and religious instruction and worship, than by all the Prisons and Poor-houses that were ever established and supported by taxation.[574]

Cemeteries entered into this classic liberal equation by dint of their quasi-religious function and their promise of permanent repose. While the county commissioners claimed their proposal "would not for a moment stay the gospel chariot," Price asserted that it would "destroy all those delicate and sacred trusts by which the gospel and the blessed charities it promotes are dependant for encouragement and support." Eminent domain was the threat here. If cemeteries were taxable, Price reasoned, their lots could be seized for back taxes. It was precisely to prevent such action that Woodlands conveyed only burial rights, and now the commissioners' plan attacked that arrangement: "It is a proceeding against the *thing*, and gives clear title to the *thing*, and does not merely dispose of the right, as the former owner had it…. If the [new] purchaser buys a church or a college for taxes, he may turn it into a factory or stable; if he buys a grave yard, he may dig it out for cellars, and cast out the dead, and build houses on it."[575]

The familiar opposition of sacred remains and profane development was central to this case, for it summed up the forces Price saw at play. Graves might be property but they were a special kind: "the last resting place of families who had cherished the hope of being united in death as in life." The commissioners threatened to dash such hopes. By taxing cemeteries, they would turn the grave into an ordinary commodity: "Strangers may buy it, and commingle with them their dust, or if so minded utterly cast out the remains of the dead." Again, the evanescent ideal of community appeared. When Price invoked it, he meant the bourgeois community of living and dead families, but he conflated this

---

[574] EKP, *Taxation of Learning, Charity, and Religion,* 5.
[575] Ibid., 7.

group's interests with those of society at large. By preserving individual and family identity, the rural cemetery preserved civilization itself.[576]

County Solicitor Elihu D. Tarr saw things differently. For him, society was inherently more pluralistic and atomized, its basic unit the citizen-taxpayer. Institutions exerted a benevolent influence but might also turn a profit. Since the same could be said of individuals, why should associated individuals receive special treatment? Perhaps community in faith or in death had value. Should it come at a cost to the larger society? Calling Price's pamphlet "an appeal to the prejudices and sympathies of the Christian and the Philanthropist," he noted that every tax exemption in a given district amounted to a burden for the other inhabitants. Citizens might give to the charity of their choice, but excluding churches from taxation effectively compelled even non-churchgoers to support them.[577] When it came to analogies, Tarr made a two-part distinction. On one hand, he found Price's public-private dichotomy misleading: even if churches and schools possessed greater social utility than prisons and poorhouses, the latter were still necessary (and still dependant on taxes). On the other hand, he gladly grouped churches with cemeteries: both provided a laudable service to *their members* and both were poised to generate revenue. Here, Tarr played his trump card. Turning to Christ Church and Woodlands, he showed that the former owned real estate throughout the city while the latter had promised "speedy profits" to investors. In this light, pew rents looked like ground rents and cemeteries looked like other "large Stock Companies." Worse yet, these capital streams might converge. Quoting from Woodlands' early promotional literature, he delighted in showing that churches were intended collaborators in a sort of pyramid scheme. How could tax exemption possibly be justified?[578]

In rebuttal, Price painted much of Tarr's argument as an ad hominem affront, unworthy of discussion before a presumptively genteel, Christian audience. Nevertheless, certain points could not be allowed to stand. The need for almshouses and prisons had never been in question, only their relative usefulness. Since schools and churches were more effective in preventing social ills than public institutions were in reversing them, tax relief made fiscal sense: "the non-worshipper saves pecuniarily." Nor was such relief a radical innovation. Tarr's suggestions to the contrary, most church property produced no revenue, and both churches and graveyards had been tax exempt since the colony's founding. Finally, Woodlands Cemetery's financial predictions were not the "happy hit" Tarr believed. The venture depended on a level of church and stockholder collaboration that had never materialized. Now the owners stood over $4,000 in debt.[579]

---

[576] Ibid., 7 (both quotations). On the opposition between sacred remains and "cities of strangers," see Bender, 201-202, 205; Karen Halttunen, *Confidence Men and Painted Women: A Study of Middle-Class Culture in America, 1830-1870* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), chap. 5.

[577] Elihu D. Tarr, *Taxation vs. Exemption. An Answer to Eli K. Price* (Philadelphia: J. H. Jones, pr., 1851), 3-6 (quotation from p. 3).

[578] Ibid., 5-14.

[579] EKP, *Reply to An Answer to "Taxation of Learning, Charity, and Religion"* (Philadelphia: United States Steam Power Book and Job Printing Office, pr., 1851), passim.

The whole exchange raised more questions than it answered. Writing prior to the emergence of the non-profit sector, both Tarr and Price elided key differences between the corporate models they discussed. Were rural cemeteries really like churches? Both men thought so, though they found different meanings in the link. Should colonial policy on graveyards shape modern policy on private cemetery companies? No one claimed otherwise. The legislature ultimately sided with Price, leaving the exemptions in place.[580] Ironically, this occurred just as company profits began to rise and, together, these developments relieved Eli Price of having to make (or to reconcile) further arguments about Woodlands Cemetery's social or financial value.

But what had those arguments meant? From his earliest debates with dissenters over the nature of the company, Price evinced his belief in a bourgeois communitarianism that could survive the rigors of the marketplace. His ideal was a sort of conservative utopia, a community that favored investment over speculation, bound the living to the dead, and improved society as a whole through the medium of the family lot. Such values were not unique to Woodlands Cemetery but their existence was especially fraught there. Stockholders pulled in one direction and tax collectors in another. To counteract these centrifugal forces, Price stepped backward, using paternalistic prose to bridge the individual and the collective, the social and the commercial, the aesthetic and the practical. Success in politics and business did not resolve the issues so much as diminish their relevance. Until then, Price's metaphors and analogies served as a balm.

Philip Price's landscape complemented his brother's language. Aware of burial real estate's peculiar demands, he had sufficiently inflected the urban grid to qualify as "rural" under the emergent rules of middle-class sensibility. Some managers suspected their surveyor of willfulness. While that allegation made sense in accounting terms, it ignored the more abstract criteria set forth by members of St. Andrew's Church. There was something desirable about curving lines. Mysteriously but predictably, they attracted lot-buyers while gesturing to ideals that lay outside the marketplace. Eli Price understood the equation. Concluding his sermon on the salability of sentiment, he added:

> It is in no irreverent feeling that allusion has thus been made to solemn things, or from any thought of making such conduce to profit. It is rather with the design to impress the Corporators with the conviction that there exist objects for our accomplishment transcending in interest those of mere gain, yet to develop the truth that under wise and prudent management, profit must be the result of patient perseverance….[581]

If there were ironies or contradictions here, Eli Price did not see them. Transcendence was his theme, opposed not by the free market but by unrestrained speculation *and* overreaching government. "There is something better than mammon," Price told public

---

[580] EKP, Report for 1851; Rothrock, 582. Illness forced Tarr to withdraw prematurely from the debate. He was sick by the time of Price's *Reply* ("stricken down by the hand of Providence," as Price claimed on p. 10) and died on 13 December 1851; see Martin, 316.
[581] EKP, Report for 1849.

officials and other pamphlet readers.[582] By grouping rural cemeteries with charitable and religious institutions, he merged the consumer picturesque with the larger landscape of urban reform, creating a seamless liberal vision on the way. What was community in the antebellum city, and how did aesthetics factor in? There were many answers to these questions, but Woodlands Cemetery bid fair to be a community of feeling, an enclave of higher motives with the curve as their new sign.

Sacred and Profane

The feature that most intrigued mid-nineteenth-century visitors to Woodlands Cemetery was William Hamilton's house. Monuments, the usual source of historical interest on cemetery tours, dotted the grounds only gradually. In the meantime, reminders of the estate's domestic past stayed in evidence, conjuring up memories and associations that Philadelphians would ponder at length. One visitor confided to a local newspaper:

> During a recent funeral service held in the parlor of the old country house of the Hamilton family, now inclosed [sic] in the Woodlands Cemetery, its parlor used as needs be as a chapel by the cemetery company, I was much struck with the size of the spacious, oval-shaped room, with its high ceiling and beautiful stained-glass windows – remnants of former splendor. Time was when this old house and room saw many a stately minuet and echoed many a silvery laugh from the fair women, attended by the brave men, of old-time Philadelphia…. When was this manor-house erected?[583]

Typical of such meditations was the author's sense of nostalgia. Old enough to recall childhood trips to the house in its earlier, private state, his memories were further enlivened by stories his father had told him "of provincial splendor that had formerly reigned there." Those days were rapidly receding. The link to a colonial golden age still seemed tangible, but it took two generations' imaginations to forge it. Equally typical was the confusion over historical details and the concomitant desire for clarity. When was the house built? What were Hamilton's politics, and did any of his descendents still live in the city? Tellingly, the writer included modern stained-glass windows among the "remnants of former splendor."[584]

Cemetery managers were slow to exploit the house's symbolic and practical potential. Although an early pamphlet mentioned plans for turning the building "into a church, &c.," this project remained incomplete well into 1850s.[585] The presence of pugnacious

---

[582] EKP, *Taxation of Learning, Charity, and Religion,* 8.
[583] Undated clipping, Castner Collection, v. 43, p. 21, Free Library of Philadelphia.
[584] Ibid. For similar queries, see John McAllister to EKP, 6 June 1868, "Famous Merchants" vol., no. 164, Dreer Coll., HSP. On the broader significance of memory in this context, see Michael Kammen, *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991), chaps. 1-3; Gary Nash, *First City: Philadelphia and the Forging of Historical Memory* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), passim.
[585] *Reports Relative to the Woodlands Cemetery,* 9 (quotation); Receipt Books, 3 February 1852 (benches), 23 September 1854 ("calcinning walls & ceiling"), 14 November 1855 (stained-glass windows).

gardener William Carvill factored in the delay. His lease commenced in the fall of 1844, and while it allowed managers to use the saloon (or "hall," in contemporary parlance) for funerals, that clause was one of many Carvill soon ignored. Gradually, access became a major point of contention. When the company finally took its case to court, several witnesses obligingly testified that "Cemeteries round Phila usually have Chapels…It is customary in New York & Boston – There is one at Laurel Hill."[586]

Rural cemeteries now seemed incomplete without chapels. Laurel Hill had set the precedent in America with a Gothic Revival structure designed by John Notman.[587] Also creditable to Laurel Hill was the idea of using an aging "country house" for the purpose: prior to the completion of Notman's building, Joseph Sims' mansion had accommodated funerals.[588] Practical necessity entered into such decisions, as the nostalgic funeral-goer implied. Yet the very nature of his query showed that other, more abstract meanings attached to the space he had visited. What trends in American culture conspired to make the chapel so rich in associations? Historians have analyzed, perhaps over-analyzed, those developments but neglected their strange intersection at Woodlands Cemetery.

The case for "secularization" in antebellum American culture has almost certainly been overplayed. If William Hamilton's mansion never became a church in the conventional sense, its corporate renovators nonetheless catered to what Colleen McDannell calls "the fundamentally religious outlook of middle-class Americans during the nineteenth century."[589] The tradition of churchyard burial remained strong in this period. Most lot-buyers had no conscious desire to break from it and most cemetery proprietors had no reason to emphasize the departure. Instead, stained-glass windows and prominent bells suggested continuity, as did the sad, soft prose of contemporary consolation literature.[590] Woodlands' attempts to woo churches stemmed partly from a wish to receive their sanction. And while church involvement failed to meet managers' expectations, Hamilton's house did start to function in certain customarily religious ways. Not only did mourners gather there, lots near the building also commanded higher prices – a presumably unintentional nod to ancient ecclesiastical practice.[591]

At the same time, several undeniably modern currents ran through this diffuse middle-class spirituality, conferring special importance on the chapel's housebound setting. Starting in the 1840s, contributors to such popular literary journals as *the North American Review* insisted that funeral services be conducted outside the home. According to one

---

[586] Rough minutes from "Woodlands Cemetery vs. Sprague," 30 March 1850, WCCC. For background, see lease from WCC to William Carvill, 23 October 1844, WCCC.
[587] In 1841, a popular writer had rebuked American rural cemeteries for not following Laurel Hill's lead quickly enough; see [Brazer], 397. On Notman's building, see Phoebe Stanton, *The Gothic Revival and American Church Architecture* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1968), 46; Wunsch, "Laurel Hill Cemetery," 14-15.
[588] *United States Gazette*, 12 December 1836. Founders of Monument Cemetery briefly toyed with same idea. See *The Monument Cemetery of Philadelphia. (Late Pere La Chaise) Containing Several Scientific Essays on the Subject of Rural Cemeteries* (Philadelphia: John A. Elkinton, 1837), 15.
[589] McDannell, 278.
[590] Schuyler, "Evolution of the Anglo-American Rural Cemetery," 291-292; Douglas, 60-61. On the use of bells on Woodlands Cemetery's grounds, see Managers Minutes, 19 October 1850, 1 September 1863.
[591] Managers Minutes, 4 November 1843.

critic, old-style funerals were objectionable because "They render much bustle and irksome preparation necessary; they fill the house of mourning with strangers, many of whom are often drawn thither by no worthier motive than vulgar curiosity; they disarrange the home of the mourner, and interrupt the usual habits of the family…."[592] Yet if conventional practice risked turning the home into "a sort of temporary bazar [sic]," the contemporary emphasis on family and privacy still dictated a quasi-domestic solution. Living in an age of rapid industrialization and urban growth, white-collar husbands and their ostensibly cloistered wives increasingly discussed home as a place of refuge and retreat, a sanctum in an almost religious sense.[593] The resulting "cult of domesticity" rippled out into other spheres, connecting the parlors of the living the chambers of the dead. New funeral reforms were part of the pattern. Protecting mourners from "strangers," they gave grave lots, chapels, and even heaven itself a distinctly domestic cast. Little surprise that as managers installed stained glass at The Woodlands, homeowners around the country made similar decorative decisions.[594]

Interest in the mansion's original inhabitants suggested another cultural turn. Earlier in the century, Americans had started to enshrine their national past in museums and historical societies, signaling a New World commitment to the sorts commemorative projects that swept late-Enlightenment Europe. A related constellation of ideas motivated rural cemetery founders. Placing neoclassical tombs in pastoral settings, they used English and French landscape conventions to manage fears of historical oblivion.[595] How did Hamilton's house fit in? Judging from visitor accounts, it functioned as a sort of cenotaph to gentility. In the summer of 1860, Henry Paul Beck composed these verses after visiting the cemetery:

Time was when Health and Fashion's peer,
    Exiled by City's sickly heat,
Held their gay court for summer here,
    Beneath the shade of Woodlands seat.

The suitors met in princely hall,
    Or gathered on the verdant lawn,
While Pleasure ruled the hours at call,
    Through noon or eve, from rosy dawn.

---

[592] [Brazer], 397 (quotation), 400. On the concerns underlying this critique, see Halttunen, chaps. 2 and 5.
[593] Standard works on the "cult of domesticity" include Kathryn Kish Sklar, *Catherine Beecher: A Study in Domesticity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973); Mary Ryan, *Cradle of the Middle Class: The Family in Oneida County, New York, 1790-1865* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981). While scholars now dispute the phenomenon's depth and significance, its existence still seems irrefutable. For relevant arguments on both sides, see articles in *American Literature* 70, no. 3 (September 1998).
[594] J. Brazer advised that graves should be "set apart and enclosed, as our living homes are, from vulgar intrusion" (p. 402). Douglas, 60-66; Clifford E. Clark, Jr., "Domestic Architecture as an Index to Social History: The Romantic Revival and the Cult of Domesticity in America, 1840-1870," in Robert Blair St. George, ed., *Material Life in America, 1600-1860* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1988), 540.
[595] Linden-Ward, "Putting the Past Under Grass," passim; Richard A. Etlin, *The Architecture of Death: The Transformation of the Cemetery in Eighteenth-Century Paris* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1984).

A chapel now, that princely hall,
Where echoed tread and voice of mirth,
Receives the dead with funeral pall,
And witness "the last of earth."[596]

Historian Blanche Linden-Ward has stressed the double thrust of rural cemetery commemoration: the simultaneous desire to call out a city's cultural achievements and to enfold local worthies in a larger national narrative.[597] Those impulses were certainly at work in Philadelphia and received accommodation at Laurel Hill. However, any direct effort to draft William Hamilton into a "cult of ancestors" necessarily foundered on his Revolutionary treason trials and his apparent distaste for Independence. Such a legacy could only be usable in a very general sense. Valued more for its aristocratic aura than for its specific historical meaning, his mansion became the reminder of a polite past in which many Philadelphians might share. Beck, for instance, imagined that "tombs around the silent home" belonged to "those who erst its halls have trode."[598]

Cemetery literature hardly mentioned the house. Most pamphlets referred to "the country seat of the Hamiltons" before adding that "the natural advantages of the position were improved by the highest skill of the landscape gardener, munificently aided by the tasteful proprietors."[599] In other ways, though, the historical lessons of material remains became a central preoccupation of the company. Descriptions of "sacredly preserved" groves and vistas made the landscape itself into a hallowed artifact of sorts. As tombs entered this tableau, it became more Arcadian, more consonant with the French Romantic poetry Eli Price sometimes quoted and with the history-infused visions of the Hudson River School.[600] Hamilton's mansion was only the largest reminder of a bygone age. Tombs could convey as much symbolism, and the biographies for which they stood might be more entertaining and instructive. According to Price, much of the cemetery's future promise stemmed from

---

[596] Henry Paul Beck, "The Woodlands Cemetery, Near Philadelphia," composed for publication in the *North American and United States Gazette*, 30 September 1860. Beck sent a copy of the poem and an explanatory note to cemetery-manager-cum-monument-dealer Edwin Greble. Both the note and the clipping are filed under Greble's name in Dreer Coll., HSP.

[597] Linden-Ward, "Putting the Past Under Grass," 291-292, 296-298, 300.

[598] Beck, "The Woodlands Cemetery, Near Philadelphia." Linden-Ward employs "cult of ancestors" and "usable past" as central concepts in "Putting the Past Under Grass," 284-285; see also Nash, chaps. 1 and 6. Although nationalistic mythology did not easily attach to William Hamilton, the idea of using domestic landscapes as national reliquaries surfaced at other sites as well. As Linden-Ward points out (307), Alexander Everett proposed reworking Washington's Mount Vernon along Mount Auburn's lines. On the moral and antiquarian value of Schuylkill River mansions in the antebellum era, see Milroy, 75, 78.

[599] *Charter, By-Laws and Regulations of the Woodlands Cemetery Company* (1845 ed.), 1, repeated in 1853, 1857, and 1868 eds.

[600] Price quoted Abbé Jacques Delille's *Les Jardins ou L'Art d'Embellir les Paysages* (1782) in the Executive Committee Minutes of 30 June 1847 to refute criticisms of the cemetery's design. Delille, the "French Virgil," is often cited as a key exponent of aesthetic ideas that influenced the rural cemetery movement; see Etlin, *Architecture of Death*, chap. 5. On the sanctification of history and landscape in the Hudson River Valley, see Schuyler, "Sanctified Landscape," passim. On the importance of history's materiality in this period, see Linden-Ward, "Putting the Past Under Grass," passim; French, 57; Dell Upton, "Architectural History's Debt to Historic Preservation," *Blueprints* 21, no. 3 (Summer 2003): 4-7.

> the historic interest that it will acquire by the inhabitancy within it of the illustrious dead, or of those whose moral traits of character, or peculiar misfortunes, excite the interest of the living world still more deeply. The more it shall become peopled with the dead attractive by character, sympathy or friendship to the living, the more it will become to the imaginations of these a "spirit land," where the spirits of the departed will seem to beccon [sic] to them to visit there while living and to sleep by them when they die.[601]

Rural cemeteries' potential to function as cultural institutions had long been cited by their advocates. Mount Auburn supplied a working model: along with Laurel Hill and other influential counterparts, it served urban Americans as an arboretum, museum, and "school of virtue."[602] Eli Price envisioned something similar. Following what had become standard practice, he and the board set out to secure the remains of exemplary citizens starting in the mid 1840s. Commodore David Porter was the first and most notable installation. Long after his body's arrival, newspaper columnists began their honor rolls with a review of his naval triumphs and career as Minister to Turkey. Subsequent honorees included churchmen, doctors, and a circus proprietor; (brief, early efforts to commemorate Benjamin Franklin came to naught).[603] But Price's plan encompassed more than isolated monuments. He foresaw symbiotic communities bound by feeling and memory. Woodlands' personal and historical associations would grow naturally through the site's aging process. As "inhabitants" moved from one world to the other, the gradual accretion of burials would produce a sort of sacred suburb.

Over the next two decades, the living and the dead did indeed arrive in unprecedented numbers. Carriages converged on the site, new monuments commanded visitors' attention, and more text appeared in guidebooks. Growing respectability accompanied these changes. Long overshadowed by Laurel Hill among fashionable Philadelphians, Woodlands sometimes now held the advantage. In 1856, *Godey's Lady's Book* published a remarkably bitter litany of the woes marriage might bring to middle-class women. The crowning indignity was to die young and then "to submit to be buried at Laurel Hill, when you much prefer Woodland[s] Cemetery, and have a stiff monument instead of a plain headstone, which your successor will eventually share with you."[604] Without statistical evidence, it is difficult to generalize about this new breed of lot-buyers. Some of them certainly had money. The Drexel mausoleum was a testament to that family's New World success, subsequently underscored by their "colony" of mansions at 39th,

---

[601] EKP, Report for 1849; see also his Report for 1851 ("The time will come when many citizens whose services have been identified with the public affairs of our community will lie there, and their monuments become historical records.")

[602] French, passim; Etlin, "Landscapes of Eternity," 15-16; Linden-Ward, "Putting the Past Under Grass," 281, 285-286, 300-303, 305-307.

[603] EKP to "the Meeting of Printers, Publishers &c. to erect a Monument to Benjamin Franklin," 31 Oct 1853, WCCC; Managers Minutes, 1 November 1853; "Hamilton Mansion," *Gleasons Pictorial Drawing-Room Companion* [1853], clipping in Society Print Coll., folder 10, box 47, HSP; "The Cemeteries of Philadelphia. – Woodlands Cemetery."

[604] "Centre-Table Gossip: Bridal Vows from a Practical Point of View," *Godey's Lady's Book* 53 (November 1856): 475.

Walnut, and Locust Streets. At the same time, the apparent absence of works by architects such as John Notman is telling. If Notman designed for "respectable old family society," as one historian has asserted, it was from newer wealth that a John Kutts, designer of William Moore's Gothic shrine, received his commissions.[605]

Beneath a thin upper crust, there was probably considerable overlap between Woodlands' and Laurel Hill's customer bases. Architects handled a fraction of the monuments at either site and it was to large marble yards like those of Thomas Hargrave, Joseph Maples, and Edwin Greble that even most well-to-do purchasers turned. Angels, obelisks, and "Tombs in the French style" rolled across the landscape at mid century.[606] Family lots such as those of the Walkers and the Dallets were met by great statements of individualism such as William Moore's finial. Still, nothing comparable in scale to Laurel Hill's nouveau-riche "neighborhoods" developed.[607] Woodlands' flatter terrain discouraged mausoleums, and the Gilded-Age plutocrats near Thomas Evans' giant obelisk were relatively few in number. Nor had churches become the organizing influence cemetery managers once imagined. Instead of forming low-church Epsicopal enclaves, lot-buyers came from many faiths and showed little interest in grouping.

Perhaps more than Laurel Hill, Woodlands Cemetery was a middle-class place. Ground there remained slightly cheaper on average, though more costly than in a sprawling competitor like Mount Moriah, located two miles to the west.[608] The profusion of monuments suggested the material side of Eli Price's dream had finally come to pass. Was Woodlands also the "spirit land" of which he had spoken? The answer lay in the eye of the beholder. There is no reason to doubt scholarly assertions that many tourists and lot-buyers perceived rural cemeteries as semi-sacred environments.[609] At the same time, a patrician contemporary like Joshua Francis Fisher was prepared to argue otherwise when recalling Hamilton's gardens in their original state. Those were the days of elegant teas and servants in livery, days when "the *profanum vulgus* did not think of intruding." Once the exclusive preserve of "our local aristocracy," The Woodlands had been transfigured by "graves and tasteless monuments."[610] Fisher's eulogy contrasts

---

[605] George E. Thomas, "Architectural Patronage and Social Stratification in Philadelphia between 1840 and 1920," in William W. Cutler, III, and Howard Gilette, Jr., eds., *The Divided Metropolis: Social and Spatial Dimensions of Philadelphia, 1800-1975* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1980), 93 (quoting Sidney George Fisher). On the Drexel's residential "colony," see Baltzell, 194; Thomas and Brownlee, 303-304.
[606] R. A. Smith, *Philadelphia as It Is, in 1852,* 363. On monument designers at Woodlands Cemetery, see Part I, Sec. A3 of this report.
[607] Jim Quinn, "The Resurrection of Laurel Hill", *Philadelphia Magazine* 69, no. 9 (September 1978): 224.
[608] In Laurel Hill's early years, ordinary lots cost 50 cents per square foot, better ones brought an additional 25 cents, and a rare few commanded $1.00 (Sales Book No. 1, North Laurel Hill Cemetery, Laurel Hill Cemetery Company Coll.). Woodlands initially planned to implement the same price structure, but this proved unrealistic. Only by the 1850s did ground there fetch comparable sums, and even then the company was forced to scale back the price of desirable lots along carriage drives from 72 cents to 60 cents per square foot (Managers Minutes, 4 November 1843, 6 October 1857, 6 April 1858). Opened in 1855, Mount Moriah advertised itself as being "more than twice the area of the Woodlands, which is the next in size in this vicinity." See *Mount Moriah Cemetery Association of Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: Cooperative Printing, 1871), 9; Scharf and Westcott 3: 2360.
[609] McDannell, passim; Sears, chap. 5.
[610] Joshua Francis Fisher, *Recollections,* 219.

tellingly with Henry Beck's ode, for the two works deploy similar imagery toward opposite ends. For Fisher, the shift from estate to cemetery was a "gloomy appropriation" through which one class seized the privileges of another. But if succession struck old wealth as sacrilege, it struck Beck as consecration: now lot-holders had a piece of William Hamilton's hallowed past.[611]

Public and Private

Andrew Jackson Downing, the mid-century arbiter of American architectural taste, devoted much thought to this sort of dilemma. In his view, the physical and social barriers separating a Beck from a Fisher were Anglo-American problems, aggravated by the lack of public parks. Continental Europe had done better. Staging a dialogue between an editor and a traveler in his magazine, *The Horticulturist*, Downing reported on French and German progress: "Public enjoyments, open to all classes of people, provided at public cost, maintained at public expense, and enjoyed daily and hourly, by all classes of persons." The benefits of these urban amenities went beyond sanitation and aesthetics. As the traveler added wistfully, widespread use of parks produced "a *social freedom*, and an easy and agreeable intercourse of all classes, that strikes an American with surprise and delight."[612]

Changing patterns in cemetery usage formed the backdrop to Downing's mock exchange. The most popular institutions were falling victim to their own success. Laurel Hill had seen some 30,000 visitors over a nine-month period in 1848 and Downing estimated "double that number" at Mount Auburn and Greenwood. There was much to be proud of here. Americans evidently had a drive for self-improvement, a craving for the "wealth of rural and moral associations" that attended cemetery art and nature.[613] At the same time, many tourists seemed interested in other sorts of pleasures. Guidebooks in one hand and picnic baskets in the other, they fanned out across the grounds, creating what Downing called a "gala-day air of recreation."[614] If cemetery founders had done their utmost to attract visitors, they now pondered ways to control the crowds.

Pressures built up more gradually at second-generation cemeteries like Woodlands. Early sightseers encountered few monuments, and both guidebook authors and company managers were mildly apologetic about the property's transitional appearance. Time, lot sales, and road improvements made the difference. Omnibuses stopped regularly near the gates by 1852, and though published descriptions tended to repeat an outdated brochure,

---

[611] Joshua Francis Fisher, "Andrew Hamilton, Esq., of Pennsylvania [1868]," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 16, no. 1 (1892): 14.
[612] Andrew Jackson Downing, "A Talk About Public Parks and Garden," *The Horticulturist, and Journal of Rural Art and Rural Taste* 3, no. 4 (October 1848): 154, 155.
[613] Idem, "Public Cemeteries and Public Gardens," *The Horticulturist, and Journal of Rural Art and Rural Taste* 4, no. 1 (July 1849): 10.
[614] Downing, "A Talk About Public Parks and Garden," 157. On leisure uses of rural cemeteries, see also Linden-Ward, "Strange but Genteel Pleasure Grounds," passim; Jackson, "American Public Space," 57.

the curious still arrived in force.[615] Views and epitaphs were alluring, just as Eli Price had promised. But West Philadelphia's institutional landscape had also achieved its own sort of critical mass. When teenage brothers Aaron and Nathan Stein made their tour of the city in the summer of 1853, they planned to visit Woodlands Cemetery as part of a circuit that included the Blockley Alms House and the Pennsylvania Hospital for the Insane, located at 44th and Market Streets. Predictably, the new attention proved a mixed blessing. Like their colleagues at Laurel Hill and Mount Auburn, Woodlands managers began restricting Sunday admission to those who obtained tickets from the company. By decade's end, this policy applied to all days of the week. An updated set of rules banned vandalism, picnicking, fast riding, and shooting.[616]

Perhaps the landscape itself was to blame. Well before Downing commenced his parks crusade, his English counterpart, John Claudius Loudon, advised against naturalistic cemetery design. Straight lines were more appropriate, Loudon felt; along with spare plantings, they marked the institution as a place of "solemnity and contemplation."[617] Curves and groves befitted pleasure-grounds. Used elsewhere, they were bound to blur differences between necessarily distinctive types. Americans disagreed in prose and practice. Sometimes it was a matter of selective reading: when Eli Price quoted Loudon, he drew from the *Suburban Gardener* and politely ignored the author's advice on cemeteries. In other instances, such omissions became the basis of doctrine. When Laurel Hill's John Jay Smith reprinted most of Loudon's 1843 manual on cemetery landscaping, Downing praised his countryman for deleting the calls for geometry.[618]

Smith's and Price's occupations were important here. Presiding over rural cemeteries, both men knew what lot-buyers wanted and what national meanings curved topography had started to accrue. Downing himself believed cemetery-like environments could "soften and allay some of the feverish unrest of business which seems to have possession of most Americans, body and soul."[619] The question was, would Americans be willing to translate symbolic anti-materialism at the private level into public support for parks? Downing thought they would, but openly acknowledged the challenge. Continuing his conversation between Editor and Traveler, he made the former observe skeptically:

> Cemeteries are, in a measure, private speculations; hundreds are induced to buy lots in them from fashion or personal pride, besides those whose hearts are touched by the beautiful sentiment which

---

[615] *Philadelphia as It Is. The Stranger's Guide,* 25; *Charter, By-Laws and Regulations of the Woodlands Cemetery Company* (1845 ed.), 1; R. A. Smith, *Philadelphia as It Is, in 1852*, 362-363; "Hamilton Mansion," *Gleasons Pictorial Drawing-Room Companion.*

[616] Stein scrapbook, Athenaeum of Philadelphia (I am grateful to Michael Seneca for pointing out and discussing this source); Wunsch, "Laurel Hill Cemetery," 59-60; Managers Minutes, 4 May 1852, 7 July 1857, 8 October 1858; *The Charter, By-Laws and Regulations of the Woodlands Cemetery Company. With a List of the Lotholders, to August 1, 1857* (Philadelphia: J. B. Chandler, pr., 1857), 20-21.

[617] Loudon, "Remarks on Laying Out Public Gardens and Promenades" (1835), as quoted in Schuyler, "Evolution of the Anglo-American Rural Cemetery," 300; see also pp. 301-302 and Curl, 49-50.

[618] Executive Committee Minutes, 30 June 1847; EKP, Report for 1847; Schuyler, "Evolution of the Anglo-American Rural Cemetery," 302.

[619] Downing, "A Talk About Public Parks and Garden," 157.

> they involve; and thus a large fund is produced, which maintains everything in the most perfect order.[620]

Such a system would be impractical for parks. Downing's traveler joked about establishing "life-members, who, on paying a certain sum, should be owners in 'fee simple' of certain fine trees," but for functional and symbolic reasons, a park could not be a narrowly proprietary artifact. Downing thus concluded his dialogue with a thoroughly Price-like analogy: if the public would pay pew rents, it would surely support a small tax for natural beauty.[621]

The park and cemetery movements dovetailed repeatedly and suggestively. As American cities grew, their social and financial elites turned almost instinctively toward nature and historical memory as sources of stability, order, moral improvement – anchors in a sea of physical and demographic change. The continuities were especially clear in Philadelphia where Fairmount Park took shape around aging country houses. Unlike New Yorkers, whose Central Park rolled out over radically reworked topography, Philadelphians adopted a gentler, more piecemeal approach that selectively incorporated older landscapes and buildings. Long valued for its fine gardens and Revolutionary pedigree, Lemon Hill was also threatened by industrial development. The estate thus provided a logical starting point for the process that brought the larger park into being.[622] Equally logical was the involvement of cemetery founders. John Jay Smith was one of several editors who took the helm of *The Horticulturist* after Downing's demise. During the mid 1850s, Smith used that post to chide fellow citizens for letting New York eclipse them in park-forming zeal. When two local attorneys led the subsequent fundraising drive, their advisors included Smith and veteran cemetery surveyor Philip Price.[623]

More than his brother, Eli Price became a quiet, leading force of Philadelphia's park movement. His knowledge of local real estate laws was unrivalled, and this background served as a platform for weaving therapeutic nature into public policy. The first great step was the Consolidation Act of 1854. Price held office in the General Assembly when the act went into effect and may well have crafted the provision calling for more "open public places, for the health and enjoyment of the people forever."[624] In any case, the entire act aligned with his convictions. Bringing "the separate townships and boroughs of Philadelphia County into a city-country whole," it redefined the metropolitan landscape as a coherent new system in which services would be coordinated, infrastructure expanded, and the benefits of nature widely diffused.[625]

---

[620] Ibid., 157.
[621] Ibid., 158.
[622] Milroy, 73-79.
[623] *Recollections of John Jay Smith*, 292-95; idem, "Editor's Table," *Horticulturist*, n.s., 7 (February 1857): 100; idem, "Editor's Table," *Horticulturist*, n.s., 7 (June 1857): 280; six letters from Smith to James H. Castle and Charles S. Keyser or to Castle alone, 12 January, 4 February 1857, and undated, James H. Castle to Philip M. Price, 27 February 1857, all filed under Castle's name, Society Collection, HSP.
[624] *A Further Supplement to...An Act to Incorporate the City of Philadelphia* (1855), quoted in Milroy, 76. See also Long, "Woodlands," 305.
[625] Edwin Wolfe, "The Origins of Philadelphia's Self-Depreciation, 1820-1920," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 104, no. 1 (January 1980): 67; see also Milroy, 85.

To make this idea workable, city government would need to own and manage more land. The legislature helped clear the way in 1867 by establishing the Fairmount Park Commission; that body, consisting of city officials and court-nominated citizens, had massive land-acquisition powers, and the committee wielding those powers was headed by Price himself. Under his guidance, the park expanded by thousands of acres on both sides of the Schuylkill. It stretched deep into the rugged reaches of the Wissahickon Valley and north of the Belmont Plateau.[626] Price devoted considerable care to the work. Reviewing every relevant title, he also became involved in the Trees and Nurseries Committee and, in a gesture charged with personal meaning, planted the grounds with acorns from his native West Chester.[627]

So many themes in Eli Price's biography run together with the rise of Philadelphia's picturesque public landscapes that at times the two stories seem inextricable. Thirty years before planting hometown oaks in the park, Price had sought Chester County thorns for his cemetery. Addressing company stockholders in the 1850s, he described how trees in the cemetery formed "masses of breathing vegetation" that would purify city air for generations to come.[628] Sanitation, preservation, fine houses fraught with associations – all had been Woodlands hallmarks first. It is these continuities that seem to clinch the 'way-station' reading of The Woodlands' historical significance. Starting as a bastion of private privilege and a model of English taste, the estate became a stepping-stone on the way to America's pastoral parks. Where William Hamilton admitted only genteel strangers, Eli Price made the rural ideal available to the public at large.

Urban landscapes reflect and enforce complex forms of social behavior. Making Woodlands Cemetery the site of a "decidedly democratic process" lends coherence to a century's worth of historical data; it is a useful interpretation, at once true and insufficient.[629] In a recent essay, art historian Elizabeth Milroy concludes of Fairmount Park, "This blending of nature and culture was achieved by an unusual and often uneasy alliance between private and public interests."[630] Uneasy alliances and precarious balances likewise comprised the ballet that brought Woodlands Cemetery into being. When arguments broke out over the form of church sections, when Eli Price challenged the stockholders and was, in turn, assailed by the county solicitor – each encounter revealed an institution whose meaning was far from settled. Similar ambiguities attached to the park. Who owned it, who used it, and who would benefit from its creation? As early as 1859, irate citizens were formally protesting the city's decisions to acquire riverside tracts in which Eli Price had an interest. In later years, one opponent accused him not only of profiteering but also of clearing land near Lemon Hill "to make a road for the rich people to drive fast horses."[631] Like cemeteries, parks had stakeholders. If both

---

[626] Milroy, 81-84; Long, "Woodlands," 305-308.
[627] Rothrock, 602; obituary clippings filed under Price's name, CCHS. On the personal and genealogical significance of Price's hometown oaks, see also his *Centennial Meeting of the Descendants,* 4, 53-54.
[628] EKP, Report for 1852, as discussed in Long, "Woodlands," 284-286.
[629] Madsen, 23.
[630] Milroy, 85.
[631] [George Fenner], *The People's Paper Book; Amusement at the Park. Justice vs. Extraordinary Generosity* (Philadelphia: n.p. 1870), 4 (quotation), 86-93 (citizen protest). I am grateful to Donna Rilling

landscapes made possible new kinds of access and leisure, the public/private tensions implicit in Downing's pew-rent analogy remained unresolved, too.

The temptation to see rural cemeteries as preceding some higher stage of American urban history is understandable. Approached critically, the impulse may yet yield fresh insights. Before then, though, these landscapes, their owners, and their users deserve further study in their own right. The movement was hardly monolithic. Its regional variations and diverse corporate structures remain virtually unrecognized in existing scholarship, at least on this side of the Atlantic.[632] Why was for-profit operation accepted in Philadelphia and shunned in most other cities before the Civil War? How did religious traditions other than Puritanism affect local reception? Who were the lot-buyers, and might they have belonged disproportionately to evangelical congregations (as Woodlands' founders evidently expected they would)? Such questions are only a few of those future historians may wish to ask.

Without parks as their necessary endpoint, rural cemeteries look less like way stations than like knots of ideas and practices, some compatible, others conflicting, and most separable only in retrospect. A major strand in this cluster was the antebellum urge for reform. The impulse to improve self and society was key to middle-class identity formation, and it played out along a broad range of spaces and institutions. Toward the private end lay the sanctified domestic sphere, its clean kitchens, draped parlors, and stained-glass windows conveying notions of the Christian model home. Asylums, hospitals, and penitentiaries stood at the other, more public end; sharing the suburban home-builder's assumption that "rural" settings could cure modern social ills, they turned cleanliness, self-discipline, and Protestant morality into grand collective projects, worthy of the cities and citizens who sponsored them. Cemeteries fell somewhere in between. Private property was their foundation, but corporate oversight and communal use kept them *alive* to contemporaries. It was the friction between these elements that made the 'city of the dead' a laboratory, even a battleground for the living.

PART II. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

A. General Statement

Woodlands Cemetery lies on Woodland Avenue in West Philadelphia between University Avenue and the south end of 42nd Street. The site contains approximately 50 acres of gently rolling terrain and is bordered on all sides by trees. Relocated twice, the main entrance now opens on Woodland Avenue in front of SEPTA's 40th Street trolley station. To the south, a railroad right-of-way separates the cemetery from the Schuykill River. To the east stands a Veterans Administration hospital and to the west lies the campus of the University of the Sciences in Philadelphia.

---

for pointing me to this source and sharing her notes on it. On public parks as contested terrain, see Roy Rozenzweig and Elizabeth Blackmar, *The Park and the People: A History of Central Park* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992).

[632] Julie Rugg's studies of British cemeteries have gone further in this regard; see bibliography.

In the late eighteenth century, this site was part of a larger property that stretched down to the Schuylkill at its Mill Creek tributary. Still partially forested, the promontory struck wealthy landowner William Hamilton as the appropriate setting for his porticoed mansion and landscape garden – both elaborated between 1770 and 1800. Four decades later, when Philadelphia was rapidly expanding, Hamilton's mature trees and place in the city's historical memory suited his estate to its new function as a Romantic "rural" cemetery.

Conceived in the early 1840s by brothers Philip and Eli Price, Woodlands Cemetery's plan consists of winding carriage drives that separate individually designed clusters of burial lots. Most roads were named for trees, and, in at least one case (Cedar Avenue), the designation corresponded to species planted along the route. Subdivisions within this scheme are lettered A through Q. Of these, Sections A and B remain undeveloped, providing a buffer from traffic along Woodland Avenue. Sections O, P, and Q, along the western side of the site, are also green space, much of which is now leased to the University of the Sciences for use as tennis courts. The earliest burial-related development occurred near the cemetery's core. Starting in 1844, Section C was laid out to accommodate church congregations on whose behalf certain stockholders had claimed "allotments" or blocks of lots. Sections D, E, and F soon followed, and were joined by Center Circle, I, G, and H over a fifteen-year period. The inner burial zones feature the oldest monuments and most elaborate ground plans. Their paths form allees, broad arcs, or radiating spokes that allow access to graves and other points of interest. Many the older sections are distinguished by family lots, some featuring a central monument encircled by the subordinate markers of individual family members' graves. Laid out later after the Civil War, Sections K, L, M, and N developed unevenly. Section M became the focus of grand, Gilded Age tomb-building only to be truncated by twentieth-century land takings. Other sparsely monumented areas were often re-divided for sale as modest "single graves" after World War II.

The centerpiece of Woodlands Cemetery remains William Hamilton's Federal-style mansion. While the modern landscape hardly resembles the one Hamilton knew, its rolling lawns, large trees, and eighteenth-century buildings recall the private origins of this semi-public space. The cemetery is also of interest for its collection of funerary sculpture and architecture, chronicling 150 years of American taste. Monument forms range from towering obelisks to simple tablets and display enormous stylistic variety. Neo-classicism, Victorian eclecticism, and various strains of modernism are all in evidence.

B. Landscape Characteristics:

1. Topography and Natural Systems

   The roughly 91 acres "annexed to the Mansion house" at the time of Hamilton's decease lay on a gently sloping promontory that has since lost much of its topographic clarity. Two watercourses created this perch on the Schuylkill: Mill

Creek to the west and a stream known as Middle Run to the east. Mill Creek fell just outside Hamilton's property. Waterpower initially lured grist- and sawmill operators to the channel's banks, but by the 1880s West Philadelphia's housing developers had converted the creek into an underground sewer. Today, a former factory at the end of 42nd Street stands on the cemetery's western border. The only clear reminder of creek-related topography is a depression next to the building's parking lot; filled with broken gravestones, this crevice corresponds to a marshy declivity near which Hamilton formed his shell-covered grotto. Middle Run survived somewhat longer. In 1936, soil from the construction of University Avenue ran into the streambed, but only in the late 1940s did the Veterans Administration obliterate most of the ravine Hamilton knew as "the valley." Even now, traces of this feature remain in the cemetery's northeast corner.

An equally dramatic change has been the expansion of the railroad right-of-way along the riverfront. When the West Chester and Philadelphia Railroad acquired this property in 1853, the aim was to build a narrow track-bed. The corridor has since widened considerably since: three commuter trains now converge there as do national passenger and freight lines. In a sense, cemetery founders laid the groundwork for this transformation. Thomas Mitchell's canal plans led to the construction of coal wharves and a riverside road. Eli Price likewise envisioned a major coal transfer station on the site, and it was he who made arrangements with the railroad. Yet Price and his colleagues also took care to include height and use restrictions on future waterfront development – an innovative step at the time.

Many lesser adjustments have occurred within the cemetery's bounds. Road construction of the 1840s required considerable cutting and filling, as the company's records testify. In later decades, managers also attempted to reduce groundwater levels by building a network of drains. For all these changes, certain broad topographic patterns persist. The site's highest point is still the feature William Hamilton designated as Ice House Hill. Rising east of his "park lawn," itself partly preserved in the contours of Section F, this hillock continues to offer views of the surrounding grounds.

2. Spatial Organization and Circulation

The cemetery's road system forms a sort of historical collage. Superficially, it is a nineteenth-century artifact. Measuring 20 feet across, each carriage drive joins paths of equally uniform widths: 8 feet for major axes and 5 feet for secondary routes (or 6 in the newer sections). The curves follow a certain logic, too. As Eli Price explained, the more uneven the terrain, the more assertively irregular the layout. But within this tidy system are fragments of an earlier landscape. Mansion Avenue and its circular terminus are William Hamilton's principal entrance road and carriage turnaround. (The latter, originally an oval, announced Hamilton's interest in that form). West Gate Avenue follows approximately the same course as the estate's farm road. As such, it may actually predate Mansion

Avenue, the advent of which is tied Hamilton's larger reworking of his grounds for picturesque effect. Finally, Center Circle Avenue rings Ice House Hill.

Roads constituted the cemetery's largest early construction projects. Work commenced in the year of the company's founding and followed a straightforward sequence. First, the contours were "traced out upon the ground" in accordance with the general plan. Then, when money allowed, the avenues were "graded, gravelled and rolled," producing the smooth surfaces most visitors expected. Philip Price claimed he and his assistants had traced all three miles of roadway by 1841. The next big push came in 1845-1847 when managers were determined to "shew the entire plan." What survives of that plan leaves room for doubt. Were peripheral routes such as Ridge and Pine Avenues ever fully realized? Documentary evidence shows that Pine and South Circle Avenues did indeed take shape only to vanish in later decades. Along with aerial views, archaeology may provide fuller answers, though redevelopment of the site's eastern side precludes such work there. One interesting fragment of the eastern road network survives. It is the mausoleum-lined trace of Section M's Valley Avenue.

Existing roads and paths generally follow their nineteenth-century templates. The greatest change on paper has been the redesign of Section K, but the relocation of the main entrance has switched the principal approach from Mansion Avenue to Maple and West Gate – a significant shift in the way visitors experience the grounds. Gravel surfaces are gone, or rather, buried. In the 1880s, managers applied "slag from iron furnaces" to heavily trafficked routes. Brick appeared on paths in the 1890s, although most such paving in the cemetery dates from the late twentieth century. Grass now covers many of the smaller paths but could be easily removed. Asphalt has succeeded slag on the roads.

3. Engineering Features

If traces of the eighteenth-century landscape are hard to discern, it may be harder still to recognize the cemetery as a major engineering feat. Part of the difficulty stems from the loss of such features as the 1840s bridge that carried Mansion Avenue over Middle Run; (this structure was likely demolished when University Avenue's construction required relocation of the cemetery entrance). However, most engineering work performed at the site was of a subtler sort: the evidence survives on paper, underground, and in unobtrusive boundary markers.

The challenge posed by Woodlands Cemetery's design was to fit tight grids of saleable land into the convolutions of a picturesque road system. Accuracy was crucial because the survey determined lot prices and grave locations. Since Philip Price's working drawings have been lost, the exact nature of his method is unclear, but a reference to "plotting of the grounds in parallelograms for burial lots" suggests he may have been familiar with a technique used at Mount

Auburn.[633] Other designers have left their marks. Thomas U. Walter's Section F took shape as he envisioned, while James C. Sidney's Section K never materialized as such. This parcel, along with Sections H and N, has been partially resurveyed to create "single graves" where larger family lots had been planned.

After roads, the most prolonged and difficult projects were drains and walls. They did not, however, command equal attention at first. Enclosures were an early priority. Between 1843 and 1846, Dennis Kennedy erected a stone wall along the cemetery's Woodland Avenue front, and parts of this structure remained intact until the 1890s when replaced by an iron fence. Other borders received less substantial fortification. Palisade fences were used at first but did not last long. The crumbling stone wall along the south margin apparently dates to the 1850s, when land was sold to the railroad. Today's west-side chain-link succeeds iron fences put there in the late nineteenth century.

The need for drains came as more of surprise. Although Eli Price's preliminary soil samples revealed low moisture levels, the ground east of Section C turned out to be damp. Here, managers decided to install a seven-foot-deep drain in 1846; (here, too, was the cemetery's first section of low-cost single graves). Over the next few years drain-building focused east of Section E and south of the main entrance. Construction of a more comprehensive network commenced in 1868. As cemetery managers dried out their site's natural aquifers, they looked for ways to distribute water more evenly across the grounds. The result was an irrigation system, built in the early 1850s. Standing next to Middle Run, a hydraulic ram supplied an elevated pool in Center Circle, and this fed pipes through gravity. It was a complicated arrangement and seems to have lasted only a few years.

4. Land Use, On-site and Adjacent

Woodlands Cemetery has had institutional neighbors from the start. The presence of the Blockley Alms House to the east was a source of concern and perhaps of embarrassment throughout the 1840s, as evinced by repeated attempts "to shut out the glaring appearance" of that structure. Today, the almshouse is gone but the Veterans Administration Hospital looms closer; it is joined to the south by a 1950s sewage pumping station. West of the cemetery, the University of the Sciences in Philadelphia has acquired a former industrial tract that spanned Mill Creek. Luckily, a symbiosis has emerged whereby the university rents open land in the cemetery's northwest corner for use as tennis courts and an athletic field. (This is a low-impact form of development – much more so than houses cemetery managers once contemplated for the same location.) To the south, a high embankment supports the railroad tracks already described; to the north stands a trolley station and blocks of Victorian duplexes. Aside from the parcel leased to the university, most cemetery-owned land continues to serve its primary purpose.

---

[633] Executive Committee Minutes, 30 June 1847; *Pioneers of American Landscape Design: An Annotated Bibliography* (Washington: U.S. Department of the Interior, 1993), s.v. "Dearborn, Henry Alexander Scammel."

The only other exception is an area south of Section K. Here, William Hamilton's stable, its courtyard, and remnants of an 1850s carriage shed are rented to a landscaping company for storage of equipment and materials.

5. Vegetation

By a recent count, 752 trees dot the landscape of Woodlands Cemetery, representing roughly 50 species.[634] Many are maples (115) but there are also large numbers of oaks, ashes, pines, and sassafras. Although it is impossible to identify surviving relics of the Hamilton era without bore samples, the prospects are not good: early company records suggest significant numbers of eighteenth-century plantings were dying out by the 1850s, and as late as the 1980s cemetery staff felled last of Hamilton's ginkgoes. Still, A. William Graham's 2001 study leaves room for optimism. Of 17 especially massive and aged trees on the grounds, three meet or exceed the criteria needed to qualify as State Champions. They are: an English Elm, a Paper Mulberry, and a Flowering Dogwood. Two large zelkovas are also of interest, both because of their size and because qualified nineteenth-century observers believed trees of this species were Hamilton's. Among the largest and potentially oldest trees, several suggestive patterns appear. One is the line formed by English Elms at the eastern end of Section C. These may well have given their name to nearby Elm Avenue but they do not align with it; instead, they run north-south, perhaps a pre-cemetery orientation. Also intriguing is the location of a great zelkova: it stands where a large clump bordered Hamilton's park lawn in Charles Drayton's 1806 sketch.

In theory, the hunt for nineteenth-century trees should be easier. Unfortunately, cemetery managers kept no planting plans, and references suggesting a correlation between species and road names do little to explain present conditions. Again, bore samples are a promising technique. Combined with plant lists and aerial views, they may well reveal antebellum landscape patterns. In the meantime, the best-documented planting campaigns are those of the late 1950s and early 1960s. The main goal here was to build up the southern, eastern, and western borders with trees and hedges. Many are still in place. It is also important to recognize how much of the cemetery's peripheral growth now consists of volunteers. This is especially true in the northeast and southwest corners where land slopes down toward former stream beds.[635]

6. Water Bodies and Features

There are no bodies of water on the cemetery grounds. Pools associated with a mid-nineteenth-century irrigation system were short-lived and were not replaced. On Middle Run and Mill Creek, see Topography and Natural Systems, above.

---

[634] Much of the following description is based on Graham, 28-29, and accompanying inventory.
[635] For a fuller discussion of conditions at the cemetery's margins, see Fry, 24-30.

7. Views and Vistas

Vistas were once a central attraction of The Woodlands. Hamilton relished (and then regretted) his ability to glimpse Philadelphia from his house. His visitors rhapsodized about views down the Schuylkill, making even the Delaware River and distant New Jersey part of the estate's carefully controlled scenography. The city is now out of sight, obscured largely by the Veterans Hospital. Rail lines and remedial plantings have likewise broken visual ties with the river (and tank farms now stretch off to the southeast). Nonetheless, some interesting internal views persist. Aimed properly, a camera may still capture Section F's axial relationship to the mansion or Center Circle's command of its immediate surroundings.

C. Built Features

1. Buildings and Structures

The cemetery's most prominent building is William Hamilton's mansion. Standing at the south end of tableland that centers on Section F, the building rises two stories high and turns a colossal tetrastyle portico toward the river. Hamilton was intent on weaving architecture and landscape together. The portico's long reach helped achieve this purpose, as did bay windows, mirrored doors, and a sunken service passage that led to the stable. In terms of site planning, the house functioned as an anchor or datum. The greenhouse complex to the west was aligned in parallel while the stable's orientation appears intentionally oblique. Also emanating from the mansion were stylistic and formal cues. The stable picked them up in its niches, blind arches, and five-bay façade; the original gate lodges were similarly inflected, and John McArthur, Jr.'s, triumphal replacement reworked these allusions in a heavy, exaggerated manner.

The stable is a remarkable structure, both for the architectural attention it received and for the mere fact of its survival. Like the house, the stable is built of Wissahickon schist, left unstuccoed except for the niches. Also like the house, the outbuilding has expanded laterally, its shed-roofed additions maintaining the original fabric's belt courses and blind arches. Immediately to the southwest are the ruins of an octagonal carriage shed. Erected by the cemetery company in the mid 1850s, the stone enclosure employed a double-pitched roof and was designed to accommodate funeral-goers.

Access to the cemetery is through two sets of gates, both facing Woodland Avenue. The larger pair to the east make up the public entrance and were designed by Paul Cret in 1936. Cret considered reusing elements of McArthur's building, perhaps to appease preservationists. Ultimately, though, the board settled on the sober update of Greco-Roman forms that stands today: two cornice-capped lodges built of limestone ashlar and flanking iron screens on bundle-column supports. Solid as it was, this structure stayed in place for only twelve years before hospital construction forced removal to the present location. The

West Gate is a service entrance and far more modest. Consisting of schist-block piers and decorated iron rods, it apparently dates from the same period as the iron fencing that replaced the front wall in the 1880s and 1890s.

Many monuments in the cemetery are large enough to qualify as buildings. The oldest such structure is the Drexel Mausoleum (1863; Drexel Circle), a Roman Doric temple attributed to architects Edward Collins and Charles Autenrieth. Not for another two decades would other freestanding mausolea crop up on the site. They include the ponderous Gothic chapel of the McDaniel family (1887), done in the style of Frank Furness, and the domed, vaguely Romanesque Burns-Detre tomb (ca. 1882). Hillside vaults offered a more affordable alternative, since only their fronts stood in full view. Still, the Tudor duplex of the Suddards and Manuel families (ca. 1868) is hardly a testament to thrift. Housing William Suddards, rector of a large Episcopal church that bought lots in the cemetery, the crenellated structure confronts Vault Avenue with a protruding marble head, perhaps of Father Time or of Rev. Suddards himself.

The Gilded Age brought about new concentrations of wealth, apparent in city and cemetery alike. At Woodlands, the real estate preferred by tycoons was in Section M, home to steamship magnate Jacob Neafie and Napoleon III's dentist, Thomas Evans (1901). Evans' obelisk and the surrounding plaza seem public in scale and expense; (fittingly, the same architects designed Philadelphia's Reading Terminal and Drexel University's main building). In a sense, though, Section M was a false start. Two decades after railroad executive Thomas A. Scott set the neighborhood's tone (1881), construction of elaborate tombs ceased there. Vaults on Valley Avenue point to a road not taken.

Before Section M, there was Center Circle. The cemetery's founders considered this high ground to be the site's most desirable location and set lot prices accordingly. They also made the circle an honorific spot. Here, Commodore David Porter was re-interred in 1845. His monument, a square marble column capped by an eagle and decked with nautical motifs, points to the republican and patriotic impulses that shaped early iconography at the cemetery (1847). Predictably, perhaps, the Civil War revived interest in much the same repertoire. The obelisk of Major General David Bell Birney, decorated at its base with a sword, serves as a case in point (1864).

Tombs in Center Circle and in Section M are not representative examples; they are extraordinary structures, commemorating financial or military prowess. A very different pattern developed east of Elm Avenue, starting in the 1840s. This historically damp area was the site of the first single graves. Many were subsequently occupied by Civil War dead, only to be vacated two decades later for want of government largesse. Today, neither the name and nor the outline of Union Avenue survives to record this episode but the "general interment" zones of Sections L and N are still among the most modest on the site. Rather than obelisks or columns, the dominant forms here are low blocks or tablets.

Most of Woodlands' monuments fall somewhere between these extremes. Historians of nineteenth-century American society stress individualism *and* new forms of group association as hallmarks of the era. Since evidence of both tendencies appears in the 'city of the dead,' it may be more useful to differentiate between enclosure (which was common) and eccentricity (which was not). William Moore's architect-designed Gothic finial proclaimed his success as an undertaker (by 1868); built long before his demise, it commanded attention because nothing else like it stood on the grounds. Rather, the trend was toward broad similarity. Early lot-holders favored obelisks and round-headed tablets, as a tour of Section C will show. Indeed, demand for such basic types constituted the core business of marble yards such as those of Edwin Greble or Thomas Hargrave (see, for example, the Tevis monument (ca. 1852). Even as Victorian taste veered toward more sculptural forms, the range of expression remained limited. Obelisks were reworked as Gothic finals; broken columns were Tuscan or Doric; angels adopted three or four conventional poses. If cradle-graves or "tombs in the French style" are relative rarities, it is because so many of them have been swept away in the drive for easy maintenance.

More than uniqueness, early lot-owners sought boundedness. Again, modern caretakers have diminished the effect, but it emerges clearly in period views and in a few surviving examples; see lots belonging to the Dallets, the Catherwoods and the Callaghans. Iron and marble fences are only the most obvious manifestations. Heavy granite curbstones should also be included, as should corner-posts with or without connecting rails. Another key tendency, though somewhat less pronounced, was toward visual hierarchy. Here, parallel cases are intriguing. A lot such as the Reyenthalers' may seem to announce unity or patriarchy within the Victorian family with its central monument and diminutive markers, yet the same scheme crops up in institutional plots such as those of the St. Andrews Society (ca. 1910) and the Deaconesses of the Mary J. Drexel Home (1889). Enclosure was crucial, but perhaps social structures ran deeper than lot fences suggest.

2. Small-scale Features

As mentioned above, nineteenth-century family lots typically employed some sort of enclosure or set of boundary markers. Motivated by "landscape lawn" aesthetics and by the desire to facilitate maintenance, cemetery managers began banning iron lot fences as early as 1869. Granite curbs were an acceptable alternative, either flush with the ground or elevated slightly above it. However, as lot-care funds ebbed and business slumped in the mid twentieth century, maintenance concerns became paramount. The new campaign against "clutter" swept away not only iron and marble enclosures but also many of the cradle-

tombs on which 1850s guidebooks had commented. Intact examples survive of all these features. Dump sites around the grounds show many more were lost.[636]

Aside form lot enclosures and monuments, few other landscape features fall under the "small-scale" rubric. Benches are absent except as occasional lot furnishings. There are no lamp poles, garbage cans, or other such accoutrements usually associated with urban parks.

3. Archaeological Sites

Recent investigation has shown Woodlands Cemetery to be a rich repository of cultural materials, both historic and prehistoric.[637] In 1993, archaeologists uncovered artifacts from the Archaic period (ca. 7000-800 B.C.) just east of the mansion's portico. Given the rarity of intact prehistoric sites in Philadelphia, this was an exceptional find, suggesting the need for further study. The two other areas that seem mostly likely to preserve important prehistoric strata are the cemetery's northeast and northwest corners. Both overlooked streams, and elderly locals recall seeing Native American artifacts in the ravine now largely occupied by the Veterans Hospital.

Archaeology promises to reveal much about Hamilton's estate. Although 1993 findings were less conclusive in this regard, they nonetheless located two otherwise unknown outbuildings – one north of the stable, and the other west of the carriage shed. Also unearthed were several courses of brick that appear to be part of the greenhouse-hothouse complex. While graves have encroached on the Hamitlon-era's "historic core," much of that zone remains relatively undisturbed. Future excavation may locate more of the conservatory, the sunken walk that ran between the kitchen and stable-yard, the kitchen garden, other outbuildings, the grotto, and internationally significant plant materials.

PART III. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

A. Architectural Drawings

Collins & Autenrieth. Proposals for Drexel Mausoleum, 1863. Special Collections, University of Delaware Library, Newark, Del. (rendering of Roman Revival temple); General Collection, Athenaeum of Philadelphia (Gothic Revival alternative; photograph).

Cret, Paul Phillipe. Proposals for Woodlands Cemetery Gate (SK 1 through SK 6 and unnumbered); presentation drawing [?] (SK 6A); construction drawings (Work no. 315); all 1936. Paul Phillipe Cret Coll., Athenaeum of Philadelphia.

---

[636] Obvious above-ground deposits include a retaining wall in the northeast corner and the large drain south of the athletic field. A mound west of the carriage shed turns out to contain more of the same; see Fry, 123.
[637] The following description is based on Fry, 21, 26-30, 42, 51-54, 67, 71-73, 116-117, 120-122, 126-128.

Harbeson Hough Livingston & Larson. Specifications for moving Woodlands Cemetery Gate (Work No. 315A), 1948, accompanied by three related drawings by contractors and city surveyor. Paul Phillipe Cret Coll., Athenaeum of Philadelphia.

B. Site Plans (in chronological order)

[Kitchen garden diagram, June 1790]. General Thomas Cadwalader Papers, Cadwalader Coll., HSP.

Lloyd, Thomas. "Survey of the Strip of Land Leased by Mr. David Jones to W[illiam] H[amilton]," April, 1803. General Thomas Cadwalader Papers, Cadwalader Coll., HSP.

Drayton, Charles. [Sketch accompanying diary entry of 2 November 1806]. Drayton Hall Coll., National Trust for Historic Preservation.

Haines, Samuel. "Survey of part of the Woodlands Estate belonging to James Hamilton Esq.," October 1813. General Thomas Cadwalader Papers, Cadwalader Coll., Historical Society of Pennsylvania (HSP hereafter).

[Plan of Woodlands Cemetery, ca. 1844]. Accompanies "Release of Mortgage, Peter Bousquet to Woodlands Cemetery Company," 19 Apr 1844 (recorded 30 Jan 1845), Woodlands Cemetery Company Coll., HSP. This plan omits eastern and western edges of the cemetery and appears to be a cropped version a large survey, (presumably same as that immediately below). Center Circle and the sections adjacent to it – future C through H – are shown in pink watercolor, indicating the 18.5 acres Bousquet is releasing. The bounds of this area are further defined by capitol letters, referred to in the document; note those demarcating a narrow right of way connecting Elm Avenue to Lehman Street. Centre Circle and eastern 3/4 of future Section E are surveyed into lots.

[Plan of Woodlands Cemetery, ca. 1844]. Accompanies "Release of Mortgage, Peter Bousquet to Woodlands Cemetery Company," 29 July 1845 (no recording date), Woodlands Cemetery Company Coll., HSP. This map now shows entire cemetery. It records Bousquet's release of an additional 23.5 acres – future Sections I, L, M and other ground north of Beach and west of Valley Aves. – showing released area in yellow and indicating its bounds with letters. Right-of-way same as above.

[Plan of Woodlands Cemetery, ca. 1844], Woodlands Cemetery Company Coll., HSP. Originally pasted in Executive Committee minutes between 1 May 1846 and 10 April 1847 entries (apparently accompanying 23 May 1846). Similar to maps accompanying Bousquet releases, less boundary indicators of released land; cropping puts this one somewhere between the two Bousquet maps in scope but same plate probably used for all three.

Plan of the Woodlands Cemetery, [ca. 1844]. Coll. of Timothy P. Long.

[Section Maps for Woodlands Cemetery]. Coll. of Timothy P. Long. Photocopies of nineteenth-century lithographs; originals now lost.

[Sections D and E, n.d., c. 1845]. Woodlands Cemetery Company Coll., HSP.

Plan of Saint Andrew's Church Allotment in the Woodlands Cemetery, [1846]. Accompanies *St. Andrew's Church Allotment, Woodlands Cemetery* (pamphlet). Shows lots in Section D, southwest of Grace Church Lots.

Plan of the Estate of Thomas Woodward, dec'd. in the Twenty-Fourth Ward, Philada. To be sold at Public sale on Tuesday October 31st 1865 at 12 O'clock noon at the Philada. Exchange, by M. Thomas & Sons Auctioneers, N. 139 & 141 South 4th Str. Woodlands Cemetery Company Coll., HSP. Shows four oddly shaped lots between Woodlands Cemetery to the north and Mill Creek and Warren lot to the south.

Plan of Section N Woodlands Cemetery, n.d. [ca. 1880]. Woodlands Cemetery Company Coll., HSP. Table of lot areas in section on verso.

Section K Woodlands Cemetery Revised October 9 1897. Woodlands Cemetery Company Coll., HSP.

Plan of the Woodlands Cemetery Property Situate in the 27th Ward [of] Philadelphia, Harvey Gillingham, Surveyor and Regulator, February 5, 1900. Woodlands Cemetery Company Coll., HSP. Note that eastern border is "University, formerly Cleveland Ave." while streets to west are 42nd and St. Marks, the latter an alley (?) between 42nd and 43rd.

Plan of University Avenue from the Schuylkill River to Vintage Avenue and Vintage Avenue from University Avenue to 34th Street, 27th Ward, City of Philadelphia, Prepared for the Use of the Board of View in the Matter of the Opening Thereof Under Ordinances Approved Jan. 22 1930 and March 19 1931, George F. Shegog, Regulator and Surveyor, 11 District, Nov. 19 1935. Woodlands Cemetery Company Coll., HSP.

Veterans Administration Hospital, Philadelphia, PA, 1000 Bed G. M. Property Map, War Department Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District, for V.A. Project No. 2871, approved 1 Jan 1947 and modified 6 October 1947. Woodlands Cemetery Company Coll., HSP.

Plan of Property in the 27th Ward, Philadelphia, Made for the Department of Public Property", Dayton F. Stout, Surveyor & Regulator Seventh District, 22 Dec 1954. Woodlands Cemetery Company Coll., HSP. Shows small parcel at southeast corner of University Ave and Curie Ave [later Vintage Ave., now Civic Center Bvd] – a remnant of cemetery's southeast corner cut off by University Ave. This parcel is one of two remnants east of University Ave. that the cemetery company sold off in 1950s. Cemetery board approved sale to City on 28 Oct 1955 and sale transpires 15 Dec 1955 according to accompanying documents.

Plan Made for the Use of the Board of Viewers Showing the Property of the Woodlands Cemetery Co. 27th Ward Philadelphia in the Matter of the Construction, Improvement, Extension and Equipment of the Southwest Sewage Treatment Works Authorized by Ordinance of Council Approved August 14, 1946, Dayton F. Stout, Surveyor and Regulator 7th District, 19 May 1955. Woodlands Cemetery Company Coll., HSP.

Untitled, undated plans, [1955]. Woodlands Cemetery Company Coll., HSP. Accompanying 22 Nov 1855 agreement between Woodlands Cemetery Company and Joseph B. Simon & Co., showing small parcel at southeast corner of Woodland and University Aves. [Long coll.]. This parcel, evidently created by realignment of University Ave. in 1930s, could well be the site of the original Woodlands gatehouse. Agreement stipulates Simon & Co. will buy the parcel for $77,500 within 120 days. In fact, accompanying documents show settlement is on 22 Aug 1956.

Wheelwright, Stevenson & Langran, Landscape Architects. "Woodlands Cemetery" (Dwg. No. 480-1), 24 May 1957 with revisions on 15 April 1963, 12 Dec 1963, 10 May 1965. Two blueprint plans filed with related correspondence. Coll. of Timothy P. Long.

C. Early Views

1. Paintings, Watercolors, Drawings, and Engravings

Birch, T. *The Woodlands, near Philadelphia, Seat of J. Lisle, Esq.* In A. Small, *The American Ladies' Pocket Book 1820* (Philadelphia, 1820), and A. R. Poole, *The Souvenir...for 1826* (Philadelphia, 1825).

Birch, William. *Woodlands the Seat of Mr Wm Hamilton Pennsylva.* In Birch, *Country Seats of the United States* (1808, and later editions).

Brown, S. E. [?] *Lodge Entrance to the Hamilton Mansion*. In *Gleasons Pictorial Drawing-Room Companion* [1853; see clipping in Society Print Coll., Historical Society of Pennsylvania].

The Drexel Mausoleum. In *Philadelphia ad Its Environs*.

Entrance to Woodland Cemetery. In Magee, *Magee's Illustrated Guide.*

Groombridge, William. *[The Woodlands],* 1793. Reproduced in Snyder, *City of Independence.*

Kennedy, David J. *Monument Erected to Genl. Rufus Welch in Woodlands Cemetery*, n.d. David J. Kennedy Watercolor Coll., Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

_____. *Woodlands*, n.d. David J. Kennedy Watercolor Coll., Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

Lieutenant Greble's Monument, Woodland Cemetery. In *Philadelphia and Its Environs*.

Major [?]. *The Hamilton Mansion, Hamilton Village, Pennsylvania.* In *Gleasons Pictorial Drawing-Room Companion* [1853; see clipping in Society Print Coll., Historical Society of Pennsylvania].

Malcom, James Peller. *Woodlands the Seat of W. Hamilton Esqr from the Bridge at Grays Ferry*, ca. 1792. Reproduced in Snyder, *City of Independence.*

Queen, J. *Woodlands Cemetery. Main Entrance.* In *Charter, By-Laws and Regulations of the Woodlands Cemetery Company* (1857 and 1868 eds.)

Sartain, Samuel. *Wm. Hill Moore's Monument, Woodlands Cemetery, Philada.* In *Charter, By-Laws and Regulations of the Woodlands Cemetery Company* (1868 ed.).

Scene in Woodlands Cemetery. In Magee, *Magee's Illustrated Guide.*

Strickland, William. *The Woodlands near Philadelphia the Seat of Wm. Hamilton, Esqr.* In the *Port Folio* magazine, December, 1809; second state in the *Casket* magazine, October, 1830.

Svinin, Paul. *General Moreau's country house at Morrisville, Pennsylvania* [sic], ca. 1812. Reproduced in Yarmolinsky, *Picturesque United States*.

[Tomb in the French Style]. In Smith, *Philadelphia as It Is*.

Watson, Joshua Rowley. *[The Lower Bridge at Gray's Ferry, from the lawn of Woodlands, 9 (?) July 1816]*. Reproduced in Foster, *Captain Watson's Travels.*

_____. *The Woodlands from the Rocks at Grays Ferry, with the Lower Bridge 5th October [1816]*. Reproduced in Foster, *Captain Watson's Travels.*

[Woodlands mansion and conservatory, 1843]. Woodlands Cemetery Company Stock Certificate, Woodlands Cemetery Company Coll., Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

Williams, Isaac L. *Woodlands, Residence of William Hamilton, 1745-1813*, [before 1880]. Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

2. Photograph Collections

Airplane Photographic Studies Coll., Free Library of Philadelphia. Five views of Woodlands Cemetery, 1927 – 1938, most too distant to be useful.

Arnold Arboretum, Cambridge, Ma. Nineteenth-century views of Hamilton-era ginkgo in Woodlands Cemetery.

"Cemeteries" Coll., Free Library of Philadelphia. Three views of Woodlands Cemetery's main entrance taken by City of Philadelphia's Department of Public Works just prior to demolition, 1936.

Campbell Coll., Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Nineteenth-century view of mansion from north, through Section F.

Castner Coll. Scrapbook, Free Library of Philadelphia. Excellent nineteenth-century views of mansion and stable.

Print Department, Library Company of Philadelphia. Panoramic photograph of cemetery's main entrance just after completion (James F. Mclees, 1858); extensive collection of nineteenth-century photographs and stereographs depicting cemetery monuments, including many that no longer exist (photographers represented include Robert Newell and John Moran).

Society Photograph Coll., Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Two nineteenth-century views of mansion and immediate environs.

University Archives, University of Pennsylvania. Aerial views taken by the university's Department of Publicity, 1910-1913.

D. Maps (in chronological order).

To the Citizens of Philadelphia this Plan of the City and its Environs is respectfully dedicated By the Editor, by Peter C. Varlé. 1796. Reproduced in Snyder, *City of Independence.*

"Map of the County Nine Miles West of the City of Philadelphia and between Darby Creek & Young's Ford on the River Schuylkill, Surveyed by Order of Gen'l Jonathan Williams, Chairman of the Subcommittee of Defense, Philadelphia, 28 September 1814, Topographical Engineers: William Strickland, Robt. Brooke, and Wm. Kneass." American Philosophical Society.

Plan and Section of a Survey for a Canal commencing at Fair Mount Dam and extending along the western slope of the River Schuylkill to Mill Creek. Laid down from surveys made during the year 1833. By J. Edgar Thomson, Civil Engr. Drawn by John C. Trautwine, Asst. Engr., Charles Fenderich, litho. In Records of the Bureau of Land Records, Pennsylvania State Archives, Harrisburg, Pa.

"Plan of the Schuylkill River, from Fair Mount to the Delaware," drawn by Frederick Graff, 7 January 1835, on *Chart of the River Schuylkill From Fair Mount to its Mouth. By Order of the Councils. Surveyed and Constructed by David McClure. B. Tanner, Sc. Entered According to Act of Congress; the Twenty first day of August, 1828, by the Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of Philadelphia, of the State of Pennsylvania.* Frederick Graff Coll., Print Dept., Philadelphia Museum of Art.

"Plan of the River Schuylkill From Fair Mount to its junction with the Delaware River," drawn by Frederick Graff, n.d., on *Chart of the River Schuylkill* (see above). Frederick Graff Coll., The Franklin Institute Science Museum, Philadelphia.

Plan of the City of Philadelphia and Adjoining Districts Originally Drawn by W. Allen Enlarged with numerous additions and corrections by F. J. Roberts, 1838. Printer G. F. Lewis.

A Map of the County of Philadelphia from Actual Survey Made Under the Direction of Charles Ellet, Jr., Civil Engineer. 1843 (surveyed 1839).

Map of Blockley Township Including All Public Places Property Owners &c. S. M. Rea and J. Miller, Surveyors. Philadelphia: Smith & Wistar, [c. 1850].

A Complete Atlas of the City of Philadelphia, Joseph H. Bonsall and Samuel Smedley, Surveyors and Draftsmen. Philadelphia, 1860.

E. Interviews

Hood, Earl. Interview by Aaron Wunsch, 9 July 2003, handwritten notes.

F. Select Bibliography

1. Primary Sources

Articles

[Brazer, J.]. "Rural Cemeteries." *North American Review* 53, no. 113 (October 1841): 385-412.

Beck, Henry Paul. "The Woodlands Cemetery, Near Philadelphia," *North American and United States Gazette*, 30 September 1860.

[Cary, Margaret G.]. "The 'Woodlands' Described in 1815." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 15 (1891): 495-497.

"The Cemeteries of Philadelphia. – Woodlands Cemetery." *Philadelphia Public Ledger*, 26 July 1871.

"Centre-Table Gossip: Bridal Vows from a Practical Point of View." *Godey's Lady's Book* 53 (November 1856): 475.

"City's Newest Street By-passing Traffic to Convention Hall Has Its Obstacles." Philadelphia *Evening Ledger*, 30 April 1936.

"Convention Hall to Get New Road." *Philadelphia Record*, 25 March 1936.

Downing, Andrew Jackson. "A Talk About Public Parks and Garden," *The Horticulturist, and Journal of Rural Art and Rural Taste* 3, no. 4 (October 1848):153-158.

_____. "Public Cemeteries and Public Gardens," *The Horticulturist, and Journal of Rural Art and Rural Taste* 4, no. 1 (July 1849): 9-12.

Fisher, Joshua Francis. "Andrew Hamilton, Esq., of Pennsylvania[1868]" *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 16, no. 1 (1892): 1-27.

"Greenwood Cemetery." *New-York Mirror* 18, 26 September 1840.

"Hamilton Mansion." *Gleasons Pictorial Drawing-Room Companion* [1853].

Laura [Sarah Wister]. "The Woodlands." *Port Folio* n.s. 1, no. 2 (February 1809): 180-181.

[Laurel Hill]. *United States Gazette*, 12 December 1836.

"Liberality." *Godey's Lady's Book* 81 (August 1870): 185.

"New Avenue Dooms Cemetery Portal." *Philadelphia Inquirer*, 8 March 1936.

Oldschool, Oliver [Joseph Dennie]. "American Scenery – for the Port Folio: The Woodlands." *Port Folio* 2, no. 6 (December 1809): 505-507.

"Penn and Cemetery Given $197,000 for 'Trespass' by City." *Philadelphia Record*, 30 June 1939.

"Philadelphia Contracts Awarded." *Philadelphia Real Estate Record and Builders' Guide*, 51, no. 20 (10 June 1936): 77.

"The Printer's Cemetery near Philadelphia." *The Ladies' Repository* 3, no. 5 (May 1869): 360-361.

Smith, Benjamin H. "Some Letters from William Hamilton, of The Woodlands, to his Private Secretary." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 29, nos. 1-3 (1905): 70-78, 143-159, 257-267.

Smith, trans. and ed., Robert C. "A Portuguese Naturalist in Philadelphia, 1799." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 78, no. 1 (Jan 1954): 94-95.

"Special Notices – The Woodlands Cemetery." *Philadelphia Inquirer*, 14 April 1863.

"An Undertaker's Story: Fifty Thousand Burials in Fifty Years." *New York Times*, 28 August 1881.

"University Avenue Extension through Woodlands Cemetery to be Completed for Democratic Convention," Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin*, 13 May 1936.

"University Avenue Extension through Woodlands Cemetery Nears Completion." Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin*, 2 June 1936.

"Visit of Manasseh Cutler to William Hamilton at the Woodlands." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 8 (1884): 109-112.

Ward, Townsend. "A Walk to Darby." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 3, no. 2 (1879): 150-166.

"Woodlands Gate Pillars Removed." Philadelphia *Evening Bulleting*, 23 May 1936.

Books

Barbé-Marboise, François, Marquis de. *Our Revolutionary Forefathers: The Letters of François, Marquis de Barbé-Marboise...1779-1785.* Translated and edited by Eugene Parker Chase. New York: Duffield & Co., 1929.

Birch, William. *The Country Seats of the United States of North America.* Springland, Pennsylvania: by the author, 1808.

Cope, Thomas P. *Philadelphia Merchant: The Diary of Thomas P. Cope, 1800—1851.* Edited by Eliza Cope Harrison. South Bend, Indiana: Gateway Editions Ltd., 1978.

Dare, Charles P. *Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore Railroad Guide: Containing a Description of the Scenery, Rivers, Towns, Villages, and Objects of Interest Along the Line of Road; Including Historical Sketches, Legends, &c.* Philadelphia: Fitzgibbon & Van Ness, 1856.

[Davis, Oliver Wilson]. *Life of David Bell Birney, Major-General United States Volunteers.* Philadelphia: King & Baird, 1867.

Bartram, John, and Humphry Marshall. *Memorials of John Bartram and Humphry Marshall.* Edited by William Darlington. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blackiston, 1849.

Downing, Andrew Jackson. *A Treatise on the Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening, Adapted to North America; with a View to the Improvement of Country Residences.* New York: George P. Putnam, 1850.

Elliott, Josephine Mirabella, ed. *Partnership for Posterity: The Correspondence of William Maclure and Marie Duclos Fretageot, 1820-1833.* Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1994.

Fisher, Joshua Francis. *Recollections of Joshua Francis Fisher, Written in 1864.* Edited by Sophia Cadwalader. Boston: Merrymount Press, 1929.

Fisher, Sidney George. *A Philadelphia Perspective: The Diary of Sidney George Fisher Covering the Years 1834 – 1871.* Edited by Nicholas B. Wainwright. Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1967.

Jefferson, Thomas. *Thomas Jefferson's Garden Book 1766-1824.* Edited by Edwin Morris Betts. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1944.

Lewis, John Frederick. *The Redemption of the Lower Schuylkill: the River as It Was, The River as It Is, The River as It Should Be.* Philadelphia: City Parks Association, 1924.

Loudon, John Claudius. *Encyclopedia of Cottage, Farm, and Villa Architecture and Furniture.* London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, Green and Longman, 1833.

_____. *The Suburban Gardener, and Villa Companion.* London: Longman, Orme, Brown, Green, and Longmans, pr., 1838.

Magee, R. *Magee's Illustrated Guide of Philadelphia and the Centennial Exhibition.* Philadelphia: R. Magee, 1876.

Manigault, Harriet. *The Diary of Harriet Manigault, 1813-1816.* Rockland, ME: Printed for the Colonial Dames of America by Maine Coast Printers, [1976].

Mease, James. *The Picture of Philadelphia, Giving an Account of Its Origin, Increase and Improvements In Arts, Sciences, Manufactures, Commerce and Revenue.* Philadelphia: B. & T. Kite, 1811.

Michaux, François André. *Travels to the Westward of the Allegheny Mountains, in the States of the Ohio, Kentucky, and Tennessee, and Return to Charlestown, through the Upper Carolinas.* London: W. Flint for J. Mawman, 1805.

Niemcewicz, Julian Ursyn. *Under Their Vine and Fig Tree: Travels through America in 1797-1799, 1805 with Some Further Account of Life in New Jersey.* Translated and edited by Metchie J. E. Budka. Elizabeth [NJ]: New Jersey Historical Society, 1965.

Philadelphia and Its Environs. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1873.

Philadelphia as It Is. The Stranger's Guide to the Public Buildings, Institutions, and Other Objects Worthy of Attention in the City of Philadelphia and Its Environs. Philadelphia: for sale by Geo. S. Appleton, 1845.

The Public Ledger Building, Philadelphia: with an Account of the Proceedings Connected with Its Opening June 20, 1867. Philadelphia: George W. Childs, 1868, expanded edition.

Pursh, Frederick. *Flora Americae Septentrionalis; or A Systematic Arrangement and Description of the Plants of North America.* London: White, Cochrane and Co., 1814.

Schöpf, Johann David. *Travels in the Confederation, 1783 – 1784.* Translated and edited by Alfred J. Morrison. Philadelphia: William Campbell 1911.

Smith, John Jay. *Recollections of John Jay Smith.* Edited by Elizabeth P. Smith. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1892.

Smith, R. A. *Philadelphia as It Is, in 1852.* Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston, 1852.

Twining, Thomas. *Travels in America 100 Years Ago* [1795]. New York: Harper & Bros., 1894.

Deeds and Mortgages

[see Part I, Sec. 2, above]

Legal References

Kittera's Estate, 17 Pa. 416 (Sup. Ct. Penna. 1851).

Mitchell v. Stiles, 13 Pa. 306 (Sup. Ct. Penna., 1850).

Miller v. Jacobs, 3 Watts 477 (Sup. Ct. Penna., Middle District 1835).

Union Canal Co. v. Young et al., 1 Whart. 410 (Sup. Ct. Penna., Eastern District, 1836).

Manuscript and Clipping Collections

Castner Coll. Scrapbook, Free Library of Philadelphia.

Clipping Files, Chester County Historical Society, West Chester, Pa..

Deeds and Mortgages (microfilm), City of Philadelphia Municipal Archives.

General Coll., Athenaeum of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa.

General Thomas Cadwalader Papers, Cadwalader Coll., Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. (hereafter HSP).

Paul Philippe Cret Coll., Athenaeum of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa.

Ferdinand Dreer Coll., HSP.

"Famous Merchants," Dreer Coll., HSP.

Edwin Greble Section, Dreer Coll., HSP.

Laurel Hill Cemetery Company Coll., Laurel Hill Cemetery, Philadelphia, Pa.

Letter Coll., Chester County Historical Society, West Chester, Pa..

Eli K. Price Coll., Special Collections, University of Delaware, Newark, Del.

Philip Price Coll., Clinton County Historical Society, Lock Haven, Pa.

Dr. George Smith Coll., HSP.

Society Coll., HSP.

Society Print Coll., HSP.

Thomas Ustick Walter Coll., Athenaeum of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa..

University of Pennsylvania Archives, Philadelphia, Pa..

Vaux Papers, HSP.

West Philadelphia Canal Company Records, Pennsylvania State Archives, Harrisburg, Pa.

Woodlands Cemetery Company Coll., HSP.

Pamphlets

An Act to Incorporate the Philadelphia Tide Lock Company, Passed the Sixteenth Day of April, 1838. Philadelphia: John C. Clark, pr., 1838.

Act of Incorporation, By-Laws, Rules and Regulations of the Monument Cemetery of Philadelphia. Together with the Names of the Officers and Members, for 1840-41. And the Third Annual Report. Philadelphia: Charles A. Elliott, pr., [1841].

Articles of Association of The Monument Cemetery Company of Philadelphia. Philadelphia: J. Thomson, pr., 1837.

Brewster, Benjamin H. *Address on the Late Eli K. Price Delivered…before the Law Association of Philadelphia on November 15, 1886.* Philadelphia: Edward Stern & Co., pr., [1886].

The Charter, By-Laws and Regulations of the Woodlands Cemetery Company. Philadelphia: T. & G. Town, pr., 1845.

The Charter, By-Laws and Regulations of the Woodlands Cemetery Company. With a List of the Lotholders, to May 20th, 1853. Philadelphia: Kite & Walton, pr., 1853.

The Charter, By-Laws and Regulations of the Woodlands Cemetery Company. With a List of the Lotholders, to August 1, 1857. Philadelphia: J. B. Chandler, pr., 1857.

The Charter, By-Laws, and Regulations of the Woodlands Cemetery Company. With a List of Lot Holders, to March 1, 1868. Philadelphia: Collins, pr., 1868.

[Fenner, George]. *The People's Paper Book; Amusement at the Park. Justice vs. Extraordinary Generosity.* Philadelphia: n.p. 1870.

Franklin Cemetery. N.p., [1839].

Memoirs and Auto-Biography of Some of the Wealthy Citizens of Philadelphia: with a Fair Estimate of Their Estates – Founded upon a Knowledge of the Facts. Philadelphia: n.p., 1846.

Memorial to the Legislature Respecting a Canal on the West Side of the Schuylkill. Read in Select and Common Councils, January 29, 1835, and passed. Philadelphia: n.p., 1835.

The Monument Cemetery of Philadelphia. (Late Pere La Chaise) Containing Several Scientific Essays on the Subject of Rural Cemeteries. Philadelphia: John A. Elkinton, 1837.

Mount Moriah Cemetery Association of Philadelphia. Philadelphia: Cooperative Printing, 1871.

Philadelphia Cemetery: Copy of the Deeds of Trust, Charter, By-Laws, and List of Lot-Holders; with an Account of the Cemetery. Philadelphia: Mifflin & Parry, 1845.

[Price, Eli K.]. *The Address Delivered at the Corner-Stone Laying of the Preston Retreat, July 17, 1837.* Philadelphia: John Richards, pr., 1837.

_____. *Taxation of Learning, Charity, and Religion.* Philadelphia: United States Steam Power Book and Job Printing Office, pr., 1851.

_____. *Reply to An Answer to "Taxation of Learning, Charity, and Religion."* Philadelphia: United States Steam Power Book and Job Printing Office, pr., 1851.

_____. *Centennial Meeting of the Descendants of Philip and Rachel Price.* Philadelphia: Caxton Press of C. Sherman, Son & Co., 1864.

Proceedings of the Special Committee of the Select and Common Councils of the City of Philadelphia, Appointed to Report Upon the Subject of the Western Canal. N.p., [1835].

Reports Relative to the Woodlands Cemetery. Philadelphia: C. Alexander, pr., 1843.

Statement of the Advantages and Inducements to Churches and Congregations in Becoming Share-Holders in The Woodlands Cemetery Company. N.p., [1845].

St. Andrew's Church Allotment, Woodlands Cemetery. Philadelphia: Stavely and M'Calla, pr., 1846.

Tarr, Elihu D. *Taxation vs. Exemption. An Answer to Eli K. Price.* Philadelphia: J. H. Jones, pr., 1851.

Wilson, Benjamin P. *Woodlands Cemetery*. N.p., 1873.

Proceedings

Journal of the Common Council of the City of Philadelphia. Philadelphia: J. Van Court, 1835-1840.

Journal of the Select Council of the City of Philadelphia. Philadelphia: Charles Alexander, 1835-1840.

Reports

Cret, Paul Phillipe, Warren Powers Laird, and Olmsted Brothers. *Report to the Board of Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania Upon the Future Development of Buildings and grounds and Conservation of Surrounding Territory* (1913).

University of Pennsylvania, Campus Development Plan. Third ed. (1966).

2. Secondary Sources

Articles

Ames, Kenneth. " Ideologies in Stone: Meanings in Victorian Gravestones." *Journal of Popular Culture* 14, no. 4 (Spring 1981): 641-56.

Baatz, Simon. "Philadelphia Patronage: The Institutional Structure of Natural History in the New Republic, 1800-1833." *Journal of the Early Republic* 8 (Summer 1988): 111-138.

Bender, Thomas. "The 'Rural' Cemetery Movement: Urban Travail and the Appeal of Nature." *New England Quarterly* 47 (June 1947): 196-211.

Betts, Richard J. "The Woodlands." *Winterthur Portfolio* 14, no. 3 (Autumn 1979): 213-234.

Cowell, John M. "The Family of Deborah Franklin." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 8, no. 4 (1884): 406.

Etlin, Richard. "Landscapes of Eternity: Funerary Architecture and the Cemetery, 1793-1881." *Oppositions* 8 (Spring 1977): 14-31.

_____. "The Geometry of Death." *Progressive Architecture* 5 (May 1982): 134-37.

_____. "Pere Lachaise and the Garden Cemetery," *Journal of Garden History* 4, no. 3 (July - September 1984): 211-22.

Ewan, Joseph. "Frederick Pursh, 1774-1820, and His Botanical Associates." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 96, no. 5 (October 1952): 599-628.

_____ and Nesta Ewan. "John Lyon, Nurseryman and Plant Hunter, and His Journal, 1799 – 1814." *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 53, pt. 2 (1963): *passim.*

French, Stanley. "The Cemetery as Cultural Institution: The Establishment of Mount Auburn and the Rural Cemetery Movement." *American Quarterly* 26, no. 1 (March 1974): 37-59.

Gibson, Jane Mork. "The Fairmount Waterworks." *Bulletin of the Philadelphia Museum of Art* 84, nos. 360-361 (Summer 1988): *passim.*

Harshberger, John W. "Some Old Gardens of Pennsylvania." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 48, no. 4 (1924): 289-300.

Jackson, John Brinckerhoff. "The American Public Space." *Public Interest* 74(Winter, 1984): 52-65.

Kimball, Fiske. "The Beginnings of Landscape Gardening in America," *Landscape Architecture* 7, no. 4 (July 1917): 181-187.

Laird, Mark. "*Corbeille, Parterre* and *Treillage*: the Case of Humphrey Repton's Penchant for the French Style of Planting." *Journal of Garden History* 16, no. 3 (Autumn 1996): 153-169.

Linden-Ward, Blanche. "Putting the Past Under Grass: History as Death and Commemoration." *Prospects* 10 (1985): 17-32.

Madsen, Karen. "To Make His Country Smile: William Hamilton's Woodlands." *Arnoldia* 49, no. 2 (Spring 1989): 14-24.

McDannell, Colleen. "The Religious Symbolism of Laurel Hill Cemetery." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 111, no. 3 (July 1987): 275-303.

Miller, Roger, and Joseph Siry. "The Emerging Suburb: West Philadelphia, 1850 – 1880." *Pennsylvania History* 46, no. 2 (April 1980): 99-145.

McPeck, Eleanor M. "George Isham Parkyns: Artist and Landscape Architect, 1749-1820." *Quarterly Journal of the Library of Congress* 30, no. 3 (July 1973): 171-182.

Morgan, Keith N. "The Emergence of the American Landscape Professional: John Notman and the Design of Rural Cemeteries." *Journal of Garden History* 4, no. 3 (1984): 269-89.

Rothrock, Joseph T. "Biographical Memoir of the Late Honorable Eli K. Price, LL.D." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 23, no. 124 (December 1886): 573-605.

Rugg, Julie. "Researching Early-Nineteenth-Century Cemeteries: Sources and Methods." *The Local Historian (Journal of the British Association for Local History)* 28, no. 3 (August 1998): 130-144.

Schuyler, David. "The Evolution of the Anglo-American Rural Cemetery: Landscape Architecture as Social and Cultural History." *Journal of Garden History* 4, no. 3 (July-September 1984): 291-304.

Snyder, Martin P. "William Birch: His 'Country Seats of the United States.'" *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 81, no. 3 (July 1957): 225-254.

Stetson, Sarah P. "William Hamilton and His Woodlands." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 73, no. 1 (January 1949): 26-33.

Tatum, George B. "The Beautiful and the Picturesque." *American Quarterly* 3, no. 1 (Spring 1951), 41-48.

_____. "The Emergence of an American School of Landscape Design." *Historic Preservation* 25, no. 2 (April – June 1973): 34 – 41.

Torchia, Robert W. "No Strangers to the Ravages of Death: John Neagle's Portrait of Dr. John Abraham Elkinton." *Nineteenth Century* 18, no. 2 (Fall 1998): 12-19.

Upton, Dell. "Pattern Books and Professionalism: Aspects of the Transformation of Domestic Architecture in America, 1800-1860," *Winterthur Portfolio* 19, nos. 2-3 (Summer-Autumn 1984): 107-150.

_____. "Architectural History's Debt to Historic Preservation." *Blueprints* 21, no. 3 (Summer 2003): 4-7.

Williamson, Tom. "The Landscape Park: Economics, Art and Ideology." *Journal of Garden History* 13, nos. 1-2 (Spring-Summer 1993): 49-55.

Books and Chapters

Adams, William Howard, ed. *The Eye of Thomas Jefferson*. Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1976.

Armstrong, Alan W. "John Bartam and Peter Collinson: A Correspondence of Science and Friendship." In Nancy E. Hoffmann and John C. Van Horne, eds., *America's Curious Botanist: A Tercentennial Reappraisal of John Bartram 1699-1777*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2004.

Baltzell, E. Digby. *Philadelphia Gentleman: The Making of a National Upper Class*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1979.

Blackmar, Elizabeth, and Roy Rozenzweig. *The Park and the People: A History of Central Park*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Binford, Henry C. *The First Suburbs: Residential Communities on the Boston Periphery, 1815 – 1860*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Brigham, David R. "Mark Catesby and the Patronage of Natural History in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century." In Amy R. W. Meyers and Margaret Beck Pritchard, eds., *Empire's Nature: Mark Catesby's New World Vision*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998.

Brogden, William A. "The Ferme Ornée and Changing Attitudes to Agricultural Improvement." In Robert P. Maccubbin and Peter Martin, eds., *British and American Gardens in the Eighteenth Century*. Williamsburg, Virginia: The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1984.

Brownlee, David, and George E. Thomas. *Building America's First University: An Historical and Architectural Guide to the University of Pennsylvania*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.

Burt Nathaniel, and Wallace E. Davies. "The Iron Age, 1876-1905." In Russell F. Weigley, ed., *Philadelphia: A 300-Year History*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1982.

Bushman, Richard L. *The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, Cities*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992.

Chaplin, Joyce E. "Nature and Nation: Natural History in Context." In Sue Ann Prince, ed., *Stuffing Birds, Pressing Plants, Shaping Knowledge: Natural History in North America, 1730-1860*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2003.

Cheyney, Edward Potts. *History of the University of Pennsylvania, 1740-1940*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1940.

Clark, J. Clifford E., Jr. "Domestic Architecture as an Index to Social History: The Romantic Revival and the Cult of Domesticity in America, 1840-1870." In Robert Blair St. George, ed., *Material Life in America, 1600-1860*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1988.

Curl, James Stevens. *The Victorian Celebration of Death*. Phoenix Mill [UK]: Stroud Publishing, 2000.

Dalzell, Robert F., Jr., and Lee Baldwin Dalzell. *George Washington's Mount Vernon: At Home in Revolutionary America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Douglas, Ann, "Heaven Our Home: Consolation Literature in the Northern United States, 1830-1880." In David E. Stannard, ed., *Death in America*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1975.

Edmondson, John. "John Bartram's Legacy in Eighteenth-Century Botanical Art: The Knowsley Ehrets." In Nancy E. Hoffmann and John C. Van Horne, eds., *America's Curious Botanist: A Tercentennial Reappraisal of John Bartram 1699-1777*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2004.

Elliott, Josephine Mirabella, ed. *Partnership for Posterity: The Correspondence of William Maclure and Marie Duclos Fretageot, 1820-1833*. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1994.

Etlin, Richard A. *The Architecture of Death: The Transformation of the Cemetery in Eighteenth-Century Paris*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1984.

Ewan, Joseph. "Philadelphia Heritage: Plants and People." In George H. M. Lawrence, ed., *America's Garden Legacy: A Taste for Pleasure*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania Horticultural Society, 1978.

Farnsworth, Jean M. "Stained Glass in the Philadelphia Archdiocese: Reflections of Faith and Culture." In Jean M. Farnsworth, Carmen R. Croce, and Jospeh F. Chorpenning, eds., *Stained Glass in Catholic Philadelphia*. Philadelphia: Saint Joseph's University Press, 2002.

Faris, John T. *Old Gardens in and about Philadelphia and Those Who Made Them*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1932.

Foster, Kathleen A. *Captain Watson's Travels in America: The Sketchbooks and Diary of Joshua Rowley Watson, 1772-1818*, with commentaries on the plates by Kenneth Finkel. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997.

From Seed to Flower: Philadelphia 1681-1876, A Horticultural Point of View. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania Horticultural Society, 1976.

Futhey, J. Smith, and Gilbert Cope. *History of Chester County, Pennsylvania, with Genealogical and Biographical Sketches*. Philadelphia: Louis H. Everts, 1881.

Geffen, Elizabeth M. "Industrial Development and Social Crisis, 1841-1854." In Russell F. Weigley, ed., *Philadelphia: A 300-Year History*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1982.

Girouard, Mark. *Life in the English Country House: A Social and Architectural History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.

Gough, Deborah Mathias. *Christ Church, Philadelphia: The Nation's Church in a Changing City*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995.

Greiff, Constance M. *John Notman, Architect 1810-1865.* Philadelphia: Athenaeum of Philadelphia, 1979.

Halttunen, Karen. *Confidence Men and Painted Women: A Study of Middle-Class Culture in America, 1830-1870.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982.

Harper, Douglas R. *West Chester to 1865: That Elegant and Notorious Place.* West Chester, Pa.: Chester County Historical Society, 1999.

Harshberger, John W. *The Botanists of Philadelphia and Their Work.* Philadelphia: Press of T. C. Davis & Sons, 1899.

A History of Haverford College for the First Sixty Years of Its Existence. Philadelphia: Porter & Coates, 1892.

Howe, Daniel Walker. *The Political Culture of the American Whigs.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Hunt, John Dixon, and Peter Willis, eds. *The Genius of the Place: The English Landscape Garden 1620-1820.* Cambridge, Ma.: MIT Press, 1988.

_____. *Gardens and the Picturesque: Studies in the History of Landscape Architecture.* Cambridge, Ma.: MIT Press, 1992.

Jackson, Joseph. *Encyclopedia of Philadelphia.* Harrisburg: National Historical Association, 1931.

Kammen, Michael. *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991.

Kornwolf, James D. "The Picturesque in the American Garden and Landscape before 1800." In Robert P. Maccubbin and Peter Martin, eds., *British and American Gardens in the Eighteenth Century.* Williamsburg, Virginia: The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1984.

Laird, Mark. *The Flowering of the Landscape Garden: English Pleasure Grounds, 1720-1800.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.

Leighton, Ann. *American Gardens of the Nineteenth Century: "For Comfort and Affluence."* Amherst, Ma.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1987.

Linden-Ward, Blanche. *Silent City on a Hill: Landscapes of Memory and Boston's Mount Auburn Cemetery.* Columbus: Ohio State University, 1989.

_____. "Strange but Genteel Pleasure Grounds: Tourist and Leisure Uses of Nineteenth-Century Rural Cemeteries." In Richard E. Meyer, ed., *Cemeteries and Grave Markers: Voices in American Culture*. Logan [UT]: Utah State University Press, 1992.

Lockwood, Alice G.B. *Gardens of Colony and State*. New York: Garden Club of America, 1931-1934.

Martin, John Hill. *Martin's Bench and Bar of Philadelphia*. Philadelphia: Rees Welsh & Co., 1883.

Marx, Leo. *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Maynard, D. S. *Historical View of Clinton County from Its Earliest Settlement to the Present Time*. Lock Haven, Pa.: Enterprise Print House, 1875; repr., Baltimore: Gateway Press, Inc., 1994.

McLean, Elizabeth. "Town and Country Gardens in Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia." In Robert P. Maccubbin and Peter Martin, eds., *British and American Gardens in the Eighteenth Century*. Williamsburg, Virginia: The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1984.

Milroy, Elizabeth. "Assembling Fairmount Park." In Katherine Martinez and Page Talbot, eds., *Philadelphia's Cultural Landscape: The Sartain Family Legacy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000.

Nash, Gary. *First City: Philadelphia and the Forging of Historical Memory*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002.

Nash, Roderick. *Wilderness and the American Mind*, 3rd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982.

Nichols, Frederick Doveton, and Ralph E. Griswold. *Thomas Jefferson, Landscape Architect*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1981.

Nygren, Edward J. "From View to Vision." In Edward J. Nygren and Bruce Robertson, eds., *Views and Visions: American Landscape before 1830*. Washington, D.C.: Corcoran Gallery of Art, 1986.

O'Malley, Therese. "Landscape Gardening in the Early National Period." In Edward J. Nygren and Bruce Robertson, eds., *Views and Visions: American Landscape before 1830*. Washington, D.C.: Corcoran Gallery of Art, 1986.

Perloff, Carl Beneson. *The Asylum*. Philadelphia: Friends Hospital, 1994.

Quest-Ritson, Charles. *The English Garden: A Social History*. London: Penguin Books, 2003.

Richardson, Edgar P. "The Athens of America, 1800-1825." In Russell F. Weigley, ed., *Philadelphia: A 300-Year History*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1982.

Rilling, Donna. *Making Houses, Crafting Capitalism: Builders in Philadelphia, 1790-1850*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.

Rogers, Elizabeth Barlow. *Landscape Design: A Cultural and Architectural History*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2001.

Rosenthal, Leon S. *A History of Philadelphia's University City*. Philadelphia: West Philadelphia Corporation, 1963.

Rothman, David J. *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1971.

Rugg, Julie. "The Origins and Progress of Cemetery Establishment in Britain." In Peter C. Jupp and Glennys Howarth, eds., *The Changing Face of Death: Historical Accounts of Death and Disposal*. London: Macmillan, 1997.

Ryan, Mary. *Cradle of the Middle Class: The Family in Oneida County, New York, 1790-1865*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Savage, Henry, Jr., and Elizabeth J. Savage. *André and François André Michaux*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1986.

Scharf, J. Thomas, and Thompson Westcott. *History of Philadelphia, 1609-1884*. 3 vols. Philadelphia: L. H. Everts & Co., 1884.

Schuyler, David. *The New Urban Landscape: The Redefinition of City Form in Nineteenth-Century America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.

_____. "The Sanctified Landscape: The Hudson River Valley, 1820 to 1850." In George F. Thompson, ed., *Landscape in America*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995.

Sears, John F. *Sacred Places: American Tourist Attractions in the Nineteenth Century*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Sloane, David Charles. *The Last Great Necessity: Cemeteries in American History.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.

Snyder, Martin P. *City of Independence: Visions of Philadelphia before 1800.* New York: Praeger Publishers, 1975.

Stevens, George A. *New York Typographical Union No. 6: Study of a Modern Trade Union and Its Predecessors*. Albany: J.B. Lyon Co., 1913.

George E. Thomas, "Architectural Patronage and Social Stratification in Philadelphia between 1840 and 1920." In William W. Cutler, III, and Howard Gilette, Jr., eds., *The Divided Metropolis: Social and Spatial Dimensions of Philadelphia, 1800-1975.* Westport, Ct.: Greenwood Press, 1980.

Thornton, Tamara Plakins. *Cultivating Gentlemen: The Meaning of County Life among the Boston Elite 1785—1860.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

Upton, Dell. "The Urban Cemetery and the Urban Community: The Origin of the New Orleans Cemetery." In Annmarie Adams and Sally McMurry, eds., *Exploring Everyday Landscapes: Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture, VII.* Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1997.

_____. *Architecture in the United States*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Wainwright, Nicholas B. "The Age of Nicholas Biddle, 1825-1841." In Russell F. Weigley, ed., *Philadelphia: A 300-Year History*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1982.

Warner, Jr., Sam Bass. *The Private City: Philadelphia in Three Periods of Its Growth.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968.

Watson, John F. *Annals of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania in the Olden Time.* 3 vols. Philadelphia: Edwin S. Stuart, 1891.

Webster, Richard. *Philadelphia Preserved: Catalog of the Historic American Buildings Survey*, 2d ed. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1981.

Westcott, Thompson. The *Historic Mansions and Buildings of Philadelphia, with some Notice of their Owners and Occupants*. Philadelphia: Porter & Coates, 1877.

Yarmolinsky, Avrahm. *Picturesque United States of America, 1811, 1812, 1813, Being a Memoir on Paul Svinin, Russian Diplomatic Officer, Artist and Author*. New York: William Edwin Rudge, 1930.

Reports

Fry, Joel T. "The Woodlands: An Archaeological Research and Planning Survey, 1993." Prepared for the University City Historical Society (1995).

Graham, A. William. "Tree Inventory and Care Needs Assessment for the Woodlands Cemetery." In Olin Partnership, "The Woodlands: Preliminary Landscape Master Plan" (2001).

Jacobs, James A. "Addendum to the Woodlands." HABS PA-1125 (2003).

Long, Timothy P. "The University Botanic Garden." TMs (1991).

Thibaut, J. "Historic Resource Study: Edgar Allan Poe National Historic Site, Independence National Historical Park, Philadelphia," TMs (1981).

Wunsch, Aaron V. "Lemon Hill." HABS PA-1010 (1995).

_____. "Schuylkill River Villas." HABS PA-6184 (1995).

_____. "Sweetbriar." HABS PA-1670 (1995).

_____. "Laurel Hill Cemetery." HABS PA-1811 (1999).

Theses

Long, Timothy Preston. "The Woodlands: A 'Matchless Place.'" M.S. thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1991.

Morgan, Keith. "The Landscape Gardening of John Notman, 1810-1865." M.A. thesis, University of Delaware, 1973.

Robbins, Owen Tasker. "Toward a Preservation of the Grounds of Lemon Hill in Light of Their Past and Present Significance for Philadelphians." MA thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1987.

G. Likely Sources Not Yet Investigated

Obvious starting points are: the Price Family Papers, Swarthmore College; the Joseph B. Townsend Papers, Dickinson College; and the Edward Coles Papers, Historical Society of Pennsylvania and Princeton University. Research for this report did not included visits to Temple University's Urban Archives or the Archives of the

University City Historical Society, both of which are promising sources of visual materials. Finally, some potentially important early views of The Woodlands remain unpublished. See Foster, *Captain Watson's Travels* (Fig. 17 and p. 334); Snyder, *City of Independence* (p. 176).

PART IV: PROJECT INFORMATION

The project was co-sponsored by the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) of the National Park Service, The Woodlands Cemetery Company of Philadelphia, and The Woodlands Trust for Historic Preservation. Research assistance and other support provided by Timothy P. Long, historical architect, Valley Forge National Historical Park, National Park Service, and the staff of The Woodlands Cemetery Company. The documentation of Woodlands Cemetery was undertaken as an Historic American Landscapes Survey (HALS) pilot project under the direction of Paul D. Dolinsky, Chief of HABS. The project leaders were HABS architect Robert R. Arzola and HABS senior historian Catherine C. Lavoie, with assistance from HABS historian James A. Jacobs. The history for Woodlands Cemetery was written in 2003-2004 by historian Aaron V. Wunsch (Ph.D. Candidate, University of California at Berkeley). Photographs were taken by James Rosenthal. Existing conditions and historical overlays of the cemetery plan were created using Global Positioning Systems (GPS) technology and historic maps. The plans were produced during the summer 2004 by architectural technician Courtney L. Gunderson (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville), under the direction of Robert R. Arzola, with assistance from Catherine C. Lavoie. The GPS fieldwork was conducted by John Knoerl and Deidre C. McCarthy of the Cultural Resources GIS Lab within HABS/HAER/HALS, with assistance from Courtney L. Gunderson, and HABS historians Catherine C. Lavoie and Lisa P. Davidson.

APPENDIX: PRELIMINARY BIOGRAPHICAL DATA ON EARLY CORPORATORS AND STOCKHOLDERS OF THE WOODLANDS CEMETERY COMPANY[638]

[638] The following sketches are drawn principally from McElroy's city directories; Woodlands Cemetery's Managers and Corporators Minutes (1840-1855); *Reports Relative to the Woodlands Cemetery* (1843); *The Charter, By-Laws and Regulations of the Woodlands Cemetery Company* (1845); *Memoirs and Autobiography of some of the Wealthy Citizens of Philadelphia* (1846); Henry Simpson, *The Lives of Eminent Philadelphians, Now Deceased* (1859); *Biographical Encyclopædia of Pennsylvania of the Nineteenth Century* (1874); J. Thomas Scharf and Thompson Westcott, *History of Philadelphia* (1884); *Dictionary of American Biography* (1936); *American National Biography* (online). Other sources are cited as necessary in the footnotes.

Henry Austie: buried in the Mitchell family plot and apparently related to the family.[639] Listed as a merchant at 147 High Street, home at 33 North 10th Street, in 1840, and as same at 139 1/2 High Street, home at 197 Walnut Street, in 1845. Owned a 1/30th share of the Woodlands Estate, a legal entity established to allow subdivision of the property before the cemetery company took title. An original corporator of the company.

William Bucknell, Jr. (1811-1890): businessman and philanthropist. He was a native of Marcus Hook, PA. Starting in his twenties, he "found speculation in real estate more profitable than following a trade. By purchase of outlying land, by building, and by taking contracts for constructing gas and waterworks in various cities and accepting stock as payment, he made a fortune. Later in life he was a broker in Philadelphia and dealt in securities and improvement of real estate…. His many gifts included over $140,000 to the University of Lewisburg, renamed in 1887 Bucknell University, and over $525,000 to missions and churches of the Baptist denomination," (*D. A. B.*). Listed as a gentleman at 139 North 5th Street in 1840, at Schuylkill 5th Street near Cherry Street in 1845, and at 260 Pine Street in 1850. Elected a corporator in 1852.

Andrew D. Cash: a conveyancer and also, apparently, an in-law and one-time business partner of Thomas Mitchell. A patron of architect Thomas U. Walter, an original subscriber to Monument Cemetery, and an early lot-holder there.[640] In 1843, he became one of five original commissioners of Philadelphia's Penn District, north of Spring Garden. As such, he oversaw surveying, street building, sewer laying etc. (Scharf and Westcott), activities that placed him in the same area and professional sphere as Philip Price. Listed as a conveyancer at 51 North 6th Street, home at 6th Street below Walnut, in 1840, and with A. D. Cash & E. R. Jones, conveyancers, 80 Walnut Street, home at 101 South 12th Street, in 1845. Held a 1/30th share in the Woodlands Estate in trust and was an original corporator.

Edward Coles (1786-1868): second governor of Illinois and an outspoken abolitionist. Born in Virginia, he moved to Illinois, was elected governor in 1822, and two years later fended off a constitutional convention that would have legalized slavery in the state. He moved to Philadelphia in 1832, died there, and was buried at Woodlands. Neither *D.A.B.* nor *A.N.B.* discuss his Philadelphia years. How he came to the Woodlands Cemetery Company and became its second president is unclear, but he may have met Philip Price at Wanborough, IL (*A.N.B.*, s.v. "Birkbeck, Morris"). Listed as a gentleman at 54 South 13th Street in 1840 and 1845. Elected a corporator and president in 1843.

---

[639] WCC lot index (Sec. F, lots 332-339).

[640] The 1825 directory lists Mitchell's partner as "E. D. Cash," but subsequent business ties suggest this is actually A. D. Cash; see also Cowell, 406; *Philadelphia Architects and Buildings Project* (online), s.v. "Walter, Thomas Ustick;" *Articles of Association of The Monument Cemetery Company,* 14; *Act of Incorporation, By-Laws, Rules and Regulations of the Monument Cemetery of Philadelphia. Together with the Names of the Officers and Members, for 1840-41. And the Third Annual Report* (Philadelphia: Charles A. Elliott, pr., [1841]), 19.

John V. Cowell: "Made his money in the retail dry goods business, and afterwards by a fortunate hit in the purchase of the house at the south west corner of Seventh and Chestnut streets. Has been married twice;" valued at $50, 000 (*Memoirs and Auto-Biography*). Thomas Mitchell's brother-in-law.[641] Listed as a merchant with the of firm Cowell & Evans, dry goods, southwest corner of Chestnut & 7th Streets, home at 128 South 8th Street, 1840 and 1845. An original corporator.

Samuel Edwards: possibly the proprietor of Samuel H. Edwards & Co., silks, at 131 High Street, home at 78 Wood Street, in 1840 (this man is a merchant on High Street near Front Street, home at 192 Spruce Street, in 1845). More likely Hon. Samuel Edwards (b. 1785), prominent Delaware Co. lawyer holding high positions in financial institutions (*Biographical Encyclopædia*). Owned a 1/30th share in the Woodlands Estate and was one the property's four trustees.

Robert Ewing: elected Sheriff of Philadelphia in 1861 on the Democratic ticket (Scharf and Westcott). Either a commission merchant at 27 Minor Street, home at 75 South 4th Street, or a merchant at 24 Chestnut Street, home at southwest corner of Walnut and Schuylkill 8th Streets, in 1840; same in 1845. An original corporator.

Charles J. Ingersoll (1782-1862): "A distinguished lawyer and politician, having been one of the prominent leaders of the democratic [sic] party in Pennsylvania. At present [1846] a representative in the congress of the United States from the fourth district, having been re-elected in 1844. He…is considered a quick and powerful debater; is the son of the late Jared Ingersoll, an eminent jurist of his day;" valued at $100,000 (*Memoirs and Autobiography*). "[He] was the United States District Attorney for Pennsylvania, from 1815 to 1829; then served in the State Legislature [1830-1831], and again in Congress from 1841 to 1849…was a member of the Convention for Internal Improvements of Pennsylvania, which met at Harrisburg in 1835; of the State Convention, in 1827; of the National Assembly for the Encouragement of Domestic Manufactures, in 1829, and of the State Constitutional Convention, in 1837-'38, in which he wrote the reports on currency, the judiciary, etc." (*Biographical Encyclopædia*).[642] Listed as attorney and counselor, 18 Girard Avenue, in 1840. An original corporator.

Joseph R. Ingersoll (1786-1868): "Brother of the above, and one of the most learned, gentlemanly, and eminent men of the day. A sound lawyer, an eloquent orator, and a benevolent citizen…the devoted friend of Henry Clay and a protective tariff. Mr. I. is also a man of strict moral principles, and a zealous advocate of Christianity. The brothers married sisters, and have often been in congress together representing the two different and prominent political parties of the country. He is one of the executors to the estate of the late Benjamin C. Wilcox [sic], his brother-in-law;" valued at $150,000 (*Memoirs and*

---

[641] Cowell, 406.

[642] *D. A. B* stresses Ingersoll's involvement in Democratic politics and opposition to expanding powers of corporations as part of his stance against the Bank of the United States (1837). See also Baltzell, 132-35, 139, 151, 168, 172, 311. Ingersoll's *Recollections* (1861) end too early to be of use here. William M. Meigs, *The Life of Charles Jared Ingersoll* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1897) says Ingersoll was long a Presbyterian but died an Episcopalian.

Auto-Biography). "He seemed equally conversant with medical jurisprudence, mechanics and chemistry in patent cases, and on general matters in geography and commerce." Elected to Congress in 1834 and served another three terms starting in 1841. A staunch Whig and devout Episcopalian – "for many years a Warden of St. Peter's Church." Charles E. Lex studied in his office (*Biographical Encyclopædia*). President of the Philadelphia Horticultural Society (1831-1836) and, along with his brother and Lex, a vocal proponent of reconciliation with the South prior to Civil War (Scharf and Westcott). Listed as attorney and councilor, 77 South 4th Street, in 1840 and 1845. Owned a 1/30th share in the Woodlands Estate.

Henry Leech: one of six original commissioners of the borough of West Philadelphia, 1844 (Scharf and Westcott). Listed as president of the West Philadelphia Railroad Company, 62 Walnut Street, home in West Philadelphia, in 1840, and as a city alderman, Washington Street, West Philadelphia, in 1845. An original corporator.

William E. Lehman: "Made his own money chiefly in the wholesale and retail drug business, here and in New Orleans. Is a brother to the present postmaster, Dr. George F. Lehman, also his security to the U. S. Government;" valued at $200,000 (*Memoirs and Autobiography*). Perhaps the father of the William Lehman (1779-1829, see Simpson); may also have given his name to Lehman Street. Listed as gentleman at 85 Lombard Street in 1840. An original corporator.

James Leslie: worked as a contractor at the cemetery throughout the mid 1840s. Elected a corporator in 1845. Listed as carpenter, corner of Schuylkill 4th and Spruce Streets, home at 200 Locust Street, in 1840; residence has moved to 262 Locust Street by 1845.

Jacob Lex (d. 1853):[643] "Of a German Lutheran family; has been engaged in the sugar refining business, now in the grocery business with his son in Market Street. He was carefully brought up in the old school by a good father; is esteemed to posses good business capacities. He is brother to C. F. Lex, who was formerly in the Board of Directors of the Girard Bank;" valued at $75,000 (*Memoirs and Auto-Biography*). Listed as a grocer, 283 High Street, home at 352 Mulberry Street, in 1840. Owned a 1/30th share in Woodlands Estate, held another two in trust, and was an original corporator.

Charles E. Lex (1812-1872): studied law in the office of Joseph R. Ingersoll and went on to specialize in banking law. A City Councilor for the 10th Ward, and, briefly, City Solicitor. Also vice president of the Lincoln Institution, a manager of the Institution for the Blind, and Secretary of the Standing Committee for Episcopal Church's Pennsylvania Diocese, well known for establishing and teaching a bible class (*Biographical Encyclopædia*). Along with the Ingersolls, a leading proponent of reconciliation with the South (Scharf and Westcott). Listed as attorney and ""counsellor"," 51 North 6th Street in 1840; lives at 352 Mulberry Street by1845. Elected a corporator in 1843.

[643] Corporators Minutes, 7 January 1854.

Charles F. Lex: valued at $50,000, was the brother of Jacob Lex and was on Board of Directors of Girard Bank (*Memoirs and Auto-Biography*). Listed as gentleman, 283 High Street, in 1840, then at 471 Mulberry Street in 1845. Owned a 1/30th share in the Woodlands Estate and was an original corporator.

John Lindsay (d. 1863):[644] City Treasurer after consolidation (Scharf and Westcott). Probably the J. Lindsay listed as carpenter and president of the Southern Loan Company, home at Belmont Place, in 1840. Unlisted in 1845 but appears as City Treasurer, Girard Bank, home at 8 Belmont Place, in 1855. An original corporator.

Garrick Mallery: "Came from the eastward. At one time president judge of one of our State Courts; also a member of the State Legislature. Has been married three times; is an attorney and ""counsellor"" in good standing;" valued at $100,000 (*Memoirs and Auto-Biography*). A specialist in real estate law and a great clarifier of titles, credited with doing for eastern Pennsylvania what Eli Price did for Philadelphia.[645] His son goes on to become a well-known ethnologist for the Smithsonian (*D.A.B.*). Listed as attorney and ""counsellor"," 56 South 6th Street in 1840. Owned a 1/30th share in Woodlands Estate, was one of its four trustees, and appears to have been an original corporator.[646]

Benjamin G. Mitchell (1809-1849):[647] Thomas Mitchell's son and conveyancer business partner. An original subscriber and early lot holder at Monument Cemetery.[648] A member of St. Paul's Episcopal Church who uses his Woodlands stock to establish the church's plot at the cemetery (Managers Minutes, 7 Oct 1843). Listed as conveyancer, firm of T. Mitchell & Son, 50 South 4th Street, home at 61 South 7th Street, in 1840 and 1845. Owned a 1/30th share in the Woodlands Estate and was an original corporator. Note that, in 1845, other conveyancer Mitchells are listed at nearby business addresses, i.e. Thomas at 48 South 4th Street and Thomas S. at 47 South 4th Street.

John C. Mitchell (ca. 1817-1898):[649] a developer of semidetached houses at 40009-4018 Pine Street in early 1860s.[650] Listed as attorney and "counsellor", 6th Street below Walnut, in 1840, and at 189 Walnut in 1845. Owned a 1/30th share in Woodlands Estate and elected a corporator in 1843.

Thomas Mitchell (1780-1849):[651] a conveyancer and land speculator who attempted to launch the Western or West Philadelphia Canal before turning his riverside property into Woodlands Cemetery. Brother-in-law of John V. Cowell. Apparently, father of Benjamin G. and John C. Mitchell, and father-in-law of Rev. Stephen H. Tyng. Entered the real estate business around 1802 and, by the mid 1820s, appears to have partnered

---

[644] Managers Minutes 7 July 1863
[645] Brewster, 30. Note that Mallery's involvement with "the coal region" may dovetail with Eli Price's.
[646] Listed as such in Woodlands *Charter and By-Laws* (1845) but not in *Laws of Pennsylvania* (1840).
[647] Obituary, *Philadelphia Public Ledger*, 21 September 1849; gravestone, Woodlands cemetery.
[648] *Articles of Association of The Monument Cemetery Company,* 12; *Act of Incorporation, By-Laws, Rules and Regulations of the Monument Cemetery,* 21.
[649] WCC lot index (Sec. F, lots 332-339).
[650] Siry and Miller, 124.
[651] Gravestone, Woodlands Cemetery.

with Andrew D. Cash.[652] Purchased William Hamilton's Woodlands in 1831 and, in 1840, became the largest shareholder in the legal entity known as the Woodlands Estate as well as an original corporator of the cemetery company. In 1841, placed all of his Philadelphia real estate in trust under Eli K. Price in order to facilitate (or obstruct) payments to creditors.[653] Listed as conveyancer with firm of T. Mitchell & Son, 50 S 4th Street, home on Walnut Street above Broad, in 1840. Listed independently at 48 S. 4th, home at 197 Walnut Street, in 1845.

William H. Moore (1804-1887):[654] a pioneering undertaker who helped form that occupation out of a traditional sideline of cabinet-making. Undertaker to presidents Harrison, Taylor, and John Quincy Adams etc. (*Biographical Encyclopædia*). The rise of Moore's career dovetails suggestively with the advent of rural cemeteries in Philadelphia.[655] Late in life, he was the subject of several humorous character sketches that parodied his lugubrious mannerisms and professional aspirations.[656] Listed as "furnishing undertaker," 181 Mulberry Street, in 1840. An original corporator.

John C. Pechin (d. 1863):[657] "For a long time collector of taxes, and vestryman of St. Paul's [Episcopal] church;" estate valued at $50,000 (*Memoirs and Auto-Biography*). Claimed land at Woodlands Cemetery on behalf of his congregation but was subsequently obliged to defend the group's design for its section against cemetery manager's criticisms.[658] Listed as a clerk at the Custom House, home at 183 N 6th Street, in 1840. A similar listing in 1845 gives Custom House as Pechin's workplace but omits his occupation. Elected a corporator in 1845.

Eli K. Price (1797-1884): prominent real-estate lawyer, legislator, and early advocate of forestry, best known for his work on Philadelphia's Consolidation Act (1854) and role in expanding Fairmount Park.[659] Born in East Bradford, Chester County, Pa., Price was a descendant of early Welsh Quaker settlers. He attended the Friends' boarding school at Westtown and, at age 18, found employment with Thomas P. Cope, a leading Philadelphia shipping merchant. Private study of law prepared Price for a career change. Joining the office of John Sergeant, he continued his legal training there and was admitted to the bar in 1822.

Price soon started to specialize in real estate law. His publications of the 1830s reflect this growing expertise as well as an interest in reform movements of the day. Land investments provided a supplemental source of income. His brother Philip, a

---

[652] The 1825 directory lists Mitchell's partner as "E. D. Cash" but subsequent business ties suggest this is Andrew D. Cash; Cowell, 406; Miller v. Jacobs, 3 Watts 477 (Sup. Ct. Penna., Middle District 1835).
[653] Mitchell v. Stiles, 13 Pa. 306 (Sup. Ct. Penna., 1850).
[654] Dates drawn from *Biographical Encyclopædia* and [J. Sergeant Price], Report for 1887.
[655] *Franklin Cemetery*, n.p., listing Moore as a manager; *Act of Incorporation, By-Laws, Rules and Regulations of the Monument Cemetery,* 21, listing Moore as a lot-holder along with fellow WCC corporators A. D. Cash, William E. Lehman, John Lindsay, Benjamin G. Mitchell, and Philip M. Price.
[656] John Jay Smith, "Recollections," MS copy at Library Company of Philadelphia, pp. 396-397; "An Undertaker's Story: Fifty Thousand Burials in Fifty Years," *New York Times*, 28 August 1881.
[657] Managers Minutes, 1 September 1863.
[658] Pechin to WCC Managers, 17 October 1844; Managers Minutes, 26 October 1844; Vestrymen of St. Andrew's Church to WCC, 2 March 1852.
[659] Standard biographical sketches include *D.N.B.*, Brewster, Rothrock, and Futhey and Cope.

surveyor, seems to have been a partner in some of these endeavors, although the extent of their collaboration is unclear. By 1835, Eli was involved in developing West Chester's Matlack Farm.[660] Four years later, he participated in the formation of Woodlands Cemetery, an institution he would manage for the rest of his life.

Price served in the state senate from 1854 through 1856. During his first term, he was instrumental in writing and passing the act that joined the City of Philadelphia to its surrounding districts. The law had far-reaching consequences. It produced the unified police and fire departments so notably lacking during the "Native American" riots of the previous decade. It also called on the City to promote public health and recreation by establishing more "squares." Created in 1867, the Fairmount Park Commission allowed Price to turn this mandate into a massive municipal undertaking. As head of the Committee on Land Damages and Land Purchases, he bought up multiple tracts along the Schuylkill River and Wissahickon Creek, largely determining the park's final form.[661]

In addition to his professional endeavors, Price maintained a keen interest in aboriculture. This devotion appears to have grown out of his work at the Woodlands Cemetery; in later life it inspired his service on Fairmount Park's Trees and Nurseries Committee and decision to endow the University of Pennsylvania's Chair of Botany.[662]

Listed as an attorney and counselor at 309 Mulberry Street in 1840 and 1845. Owned original shares in the Woodlands Estate and was an original corporator.

Philip M. Price (1802-1870): doctor, surveyor, real estate developer.[663] Philip was Eli Price's youngest brother, born on the same East Bradford farm. He, too, attended the Friends' school at Westtown, then moved to Philadelphia to study medicine. Quaker roots and scientific training likely predisposed him to progressive social ideals. After graduating from the University of Pennsylvania, he grew interested in the pedagogy of Swiss educational reformer Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi and lent support to a local Pestalozzian school; others tied to the project included Price's elder brother, William, and reform-minded geologist William Maclure. In October of 1825, Philip traveled to New Harmony, Indiana, to join Robert Owen's new experiment in communal living. Maclure and William Price soon followed, while skeptical Eli stayed behind.

New Harmony was a turning point in Price's career and outlook. Participating in the community's governance and marrying in one of its double wedding ceremonies, he nonetheless grew profoundly disillusioned with the venture's prospects and departed after less than a year. His return was not immediate, however. Along with his wife and brother, he spent several months at the English Prairie, a Quaker-influenced agricultural settlement in Wanborough, Illinois. Here, he and other New Harmony refugees contemplated "carry[ing] the social system into effect upon a more limited scale."[664] The group included

---

[660] Harper, chap. 53.
[661] Long, "Woodlands," 284-314, Milroy, 76, 81.
[662] Long, "Woodlands," 312-317.
[663] There are no scholarly biographies of Philip Price. The best source, Elliott, focuses on Price's time at New Harmony. Important repositories of relevant materials include the Price Family Papers, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.; clippings files of the CCHS; archives of the Clinton County Historical Society, Lock Haven, Pa.
[664] "Separate Appendix by My Uncle, Philip M. Price. Sunday: Aug. 1826," in Elliott, 1077. On the English Prairie or English Settlement, see also Elliott, 1069, and *American National Biography* (online), s.v. "Birkbeck, Morris," and "Flower, George."

Owen's architect, Stedman Whitwell, famed for his visionary schemes. In the end, though, the interlude's influence on Price was more aesthetic than social. Awed by the flower-dappled prairie "clustered over with groups of trees," he may have given his first serious thought to landscape design in the summer of 1826.[665] A short time later, he moved back to Philadelphia and took up the profession of surveying.

Philadelphia was growing rapidly in this period, supplying Price with ready employment. His principal focus was Spring Garden, a district on the city's northern fringe which still retained its municipal independence. Along with his partner, Joseph Fox, Price laid out new streets and determined the size of blocks. The two men also bought land in the area; (close knowledge of topography made for shrewd investment).[666] Their assignments sometimes strayed from the grid. Starting in the mid 1830s, both men worked at Laurel Hill Cemetery, Philadelphia's first foray into the institutional picturesque.[667] It was on this site, reputedly designed by architect John Notman, that Price familiarized himself with the sinuous curves and tight floral geometries associated with the English Gardenesque style of landscape design. But straight lines made for easier work. After Price joined his brother, Eli, in founding Woodlands Cemetery, managerial arguments over surveying costs forced the younger sibling to reiterate his credentials, explain the challenges of his task, and, ultimately, to relinquish his post.

The final decades of Price's life were spent in railroads and real estate. In 1852, he joined the board of the Sunbury and Erie, Philadelphia's great hope for tapping Western trade. Although the route did not, in the end, forestall New York's economic dominance, it nonetheless became an important conduit for travelers and lumber, and opened up large portions of Pennsylvania's interior.[668] Price knew the line would transform hamlets such as Lock Haven, through which it passed. Acquiring large land holdings on the northwestern end of town, he laid out a subdivision that nearly doubled the settlement's residential area and moved there in the early 1860s. Price's Addition took shape on a grid. Its tree-lined streets and suburban villas suggested the "passion" for improvements the developer had displayed since New Harmony.[669] A steeply sloping rural cemetery overlooked the Susquehanna River, and profits from lot sales supported a local public library. As a model middle-class community, the new district recapitulated major themes in Price's biography.

Listed as surveyor, corner of 12th and Spring Garden Streets, in 1840; same at Spring Garden Street above 11th Street in 1845; same at 262 Spring Garden Street in 1850; *but,* in 1855, listed under both Philip M. Price & Co., conveyancers, 216 Spring Garden Street and Philip M. Price, Secretary and Treasurer of the Sunbury & Erie R. R. Co., 50 S 3rd, home at 216 Spring Garden Street. Owned a share in the Woodlands Estate and was an original corporator.

Charles Robb: listed as gentleman, 155 S 5th Street, in 1845 and 1850. Valued at $50,000 (*Memoirs and Auto-Biography*). Elected a corporator in 1846.

---

[665] "Separate Appendix by My Uncle," in Elliott, 1077.
[666] Union Canal Co. v. Young et al., 1 Whart. 410 (Sup. Ct. Penna., Eastern District, 1836).
[667] "Statement of cost of Real Estate and improvements at Laurel Hill Cemetery…."
[668] Homer Tope Rosenberger, *The Philadelphia and Erie Railroad: Its Place in American History* (Potomac, Md.: Fox Hills Press, 1975), 202, 215, 259-260, 266-267, 641.
[669] [EKP], *Centennial Meeting of the Descendants,* 41-42. On Price's time at Lock Haven, see also D. S. Maynard, *Historical View of Clinton County from Its Earliest Settlement to the Present Time* (Lock Haven, Pa.: Enterprise Print House, 1875; repr., Baltimore: Gateway Press, Inc., 1994), 57-58, 94, 99.

Thomas Robinson (d. 1854):[670] listed as gentleman, 17 Palmyra Square, in 1840 and1850. Elected a corporator in 1845.

Benjamin Stiles: "A Philadelphian - owns the beautiful mansion in Broad street near Green Hill"; valued at $100,000 (*Memoirs and Auto-Biography*). Unlisted in 1840 but appears as gentleman, Poplar & Broad Streets, in 1845. An original corporator.

Joseph B. Townsend (b. 1821): prominent real estate lawyer who trained under Eli K. Price and belonged to a West Chester family tied to the Prices by marriage and friendship (*Biographical Encyclopædia*).[671] Unlisted in 1840; listed as attorney, 309 Mulberry Street, in 1845 and at 58 S 11th Street in 1850. Elected a corporator in 1846.

Stephen H. Tyng (1800-1885): prominent Episcopal clergyman and in-law of conveyancer Thomas Mitchell. A native of Newburyport, Mass., Tyng was ordained deacon in 1821, priest in 1824, and served as rector of St. John's Church, Georgetown, D.C. (1821-23); Queen Anne's Parish, Prince George's Co., Md. (1823-1829); St. Paul's Church, Philadelphia (1829-1834); Church of the Epiphany, Philadelphia (1834-1845), and St. George's Church, New York City (1845-1878). He was considered among the great Episcopal preachers of his day, famed for fearsome and theatrical sermons (St. Paul's was known as "Tyng's Theater" during his tenure). "He was one of the first to recognize the importance of Sunday schools and his own school in Philadelphia had more than two thousand children." A vigorous opponent of liberalizing tendencies within the Episcopal church, "he was a typical low churchman. Trained in the straitest [sic] school of Evangelicals, he never faltered in his allegiance; broad churchman was just as obnoxious to him as high churchman, and he fought both tooth and nail" (*D.A.B.*). Married Susan Mitchell in 1833 and had five children by her (*A.N.B.*). Along with John Pechin and Benjamin Mitchell, an important church-cemetery liaison.[672] Listed at 429 Walnut Street in 1840 and on Filbert Street above Schuylkill 7th in 1844. Owned an original share in the Woodlands Estate; never a elected a corporator.

James C. Van Dyke: an attorney and leading member of Philadelphia's Native American party, as evidenced by his speech on party's behalf in midst of the 1844 riots (Scharf and Westcott). Represented a creditor of Thomas Kittera, erstwhile co-owner of The Woodlands, in a lengthy lawsuit over Kittera's Estate that embroils the cemetery company in the 1840s . Held two original shares in Woodlands Estate, in trust. Elected a corporator in 1843. Listed as attorney and "counsellor", 140 Walnut Street, in 1844.

Richard Vaux (1816-1895): lawyer and politician, serving as Recorder for the City of Philadelphia (1841-47), inspector for the Eastern State Penitentiary (1842-death), and Controller of Public Schools (1840s). A Democratic candidate for various offices starting in 1839. Elected Mayor (1856) and to 51st Congress (1890-1891). Also served

---

[670] Managers Minutes, 13 March 1854.
[671] See also [EKP], *Centennial Meeting of the Descendants,* 55-56.
[672] Managers Minutes, 22 June1844.

as Chairman of the Democratic State Committee. Note: *Martin's Bench and Bar* (1883) probably gives the most accurate dates of Vaux's terms. Elected a corporator in 1843.

Benjamin C. Wilcocks (d. 1845):[673] "made his money by a long residence in China. Was a Philadelphian by birth, and the son of a highly respected shipping merchant, of olden times;" estate valued at $100,000; brother-in-law of Joseph R. Ingersoll who was one of his executors (*Memoirs and Autobiography*). Listed as gentleman, corner of 11th & Walnut Streets, in 1840 and 1845. Owned an original share in the Woodlands Estate. Elected a corporator in 1843 and president in 1844.

PART IV: PROJECT INFORMATION

The project was co-sponsored by the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) of the National Park Service, The Woodlands Cemetery Company of Philadelphia, and The Woodlands Trust for Historic Preservation. Research assistance and other support provided by Timothy P. Long, historical architect, Valley Forge National Historical Park, National Park Service, and the staff of The Woodlands Cemetery Company. The documentation of Woodlands Cemetery was undertaken as an Historic American Landscapes Survey (HALS) pilot project under the direction of Paul D. Dolinsky, Chief of HABS. The project leaders were HABS architect Robert R. Arzola and HABS senior historian Catherine C. Lavoie, with assistance from HABS historian James A. Jacobs. The history for Woodlands Cemetery was written in 2003-2004 by historian Aaron V. Wunsch (Ph.D. Candidate, University of California at Berkeley). Photographs were taken by James Rosenthal. Existing conditions and historical overlays of the cemetery plan were created using Global Positioning Systems (GPS) technology and historic maps. The plans were produced during the summer 2004 by architectural technician Courtney L. Gunderson (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville), under the direction of Robert R. Arzola, with assistance from Catherine C. Lavoie. The GPS fieldwork was conducted by John Knoerl and Deidre C. McCarthy of the Cultural Resources GIS Lab within HABS/HAER/HALS, with assistance from Courtney L. Gunderson, and HABS historians Catherine C. Lavoie and Lisa P. Davidson.

[673] Executive Committee Minutes, 1 December 1845.